

A  
VINDICATION  
OF  
Quakerism  
NO  
CHRISTIANITY, &c.  
Against the very vain Attempts of  
*WILLIAM PEN,*  
In his pretended  
A N S W E R;

With some remarkable Passages out of the  
Quakers Church Registry, wherein their near  
approach to Popery, and their bold blas-  
phemy is abundantly manifest.

---

By *JOHN FALDO.*

---

*Clouds they are without water, carried about of winds;  
trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead,  
plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the Sea,  
foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to  
whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever,  
Jude 12, 13.*

London, Printed by B. Griffin for J. Robinson at the Golden  
Lyon in S. Pauls Church-yard. and Rob. Boulter at the  
Turks Head over against the Exchange, 1672.

C 322, 573

Harvard College Library  
Peabody Fund  
May 24, 1939

I  
suc  
as  
n.1  
pla  
wa  
fol  
son  
  
I  
kn  
we  
m  
ge  
of

# QUAKERISM

## No Christianity.

**R**Eader I desire thee to take notice that the number of my Chapters answer to the same of my adversaries. I should have been glad to be excused of this irksome task, of opposing such ridiculous matter so deceitfully and triflingly managed; as will not bear the constant gravity becoming things ordinarily pretending to Divinity: I know not how so far to play the fool, as discharging a Cannon to overthrow a mouse would amount unto. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit, is an advice sometimes in season. I proceed to my work.

---

### CHAP. I.

**H**E begins p. 1. to impute my opposition to the Quakers tenets to a *mist of ignorance and prejudice*, as he imputes it in his following work to malice twenty times over. This he knows will be believed by friends upon his infallible word, and then they can do no less than cast up all of my book again that they were almost perswaded to digest to their good: for what good thing can this trinity of ignorance, prejudice and malice produce.

And p. 2. he finds another secret cause or at least a

## Quakerism no Christianity.

*causa sine qua non* that makes it look as ugly with his believers as the other three, and that is the Magistrates indulgence. When Mr. Pen can prove himself the searcher of hearts such arguments may be to purpose; but in the mean time he acts the part of a presumptuous and blind accuser instead of a disputer. Let me never rejoyce in that liberty, which leaves us bound and disabled from opposing such delusions, as overthrow Christianity it self by Scripture and right reasoning.

§ 2. Next to the accuser the Gentleman attempts to play the Sophister upon those words of mine. "By Christianity we are not to understand *all* those matters of faith and practice, which Christianity doth oblige us unto. Well, what improvement doth our adversary make of this first, to shew that he understands Logick much at the rate as he professes divinity, he reflects thus; *A strange definition of true Christianity.* But, Reader, take notice, that no body calls it a definition but *W. P.* who can make definitions by meer negatives.

But he has me on the hip p. 3. *Is it not therefore Christianity because Christianity takes it in, Egregious weakness! what an hair has he split? but it flies in his eyes, no great fear but 'twill out again, and I see never the worse.* Christianity taking in or obliging to some duties is not a cause why they are not Christianity, I confess: So also I affirm that Christianity taking them doth not make them to be Christianity. For you may as well affirm a finger to be a man when separated from the rest of the man (at least from the essential parts) as common justice, truth, &c. to be Christianity; where the true faith of the true Christ and Gospel are wanting: an account of which I gave him in the next words, and made proof of it p. 4. But he is willing you should be ignorant of that, and believe that



## Quakerism no Christianity.

5

to be my definition of Christianity which I in so many words say is not Christianity.

§ 3 But he hath another sling at that indiscreet sentence, 'tis so laden with absurdities in his esteem. *Then* (saith he) *there is something beyond all that Christianity requires to be believed and done that is Christianity, else I understand nothing.* He hath here adventured his reputation for wisdom like one that hath lost it long since. I shall take no more pains to prove my saying orthodox, and him to understand nothing upon his own terms than by quoting Mat. 19. 3. *Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every fault?* The question was put to Jesus Christ. But if P. had had the answering of it according to his present wit and humour, he would have first taken up the querist for an impertinent fellow; and then have given him this home-jeer, *If not for every fault, then for something that is more than every fault.* But the man intended no more in his question, but whether there were not some faults which though a wife did commit, yet she should not be for their sakes divorced; and so Christ understood the every fault in the text.

§ 4. He tells me p. 3. *To exclude then all antecedent times from any share in Christianity, is both weak and cruel; since it plainly shuts them out of all hopes of eternal salvation.*

If the Scripture had any where said that none but Christians shall be saved, his consequence had been grounded but he might have found asserted in my book (if he pleased,) that salvation depends on a right belief and acceptance of the Covenant of grace: and all the Saints did believe and receive that covenant according to the dispensation of it, under which they lived; therefore they shall be saved.

§. 5. To purge away the Character I give of a Quaker,  
he

he tells you p. 9. *We never said that the light within every man was the only Lord and Saviour, and very God. Let him shew us any such passage, of any one acknowledged Quaker, and he will say something.* The man cannot see Wood for Trees, I quoted him forty places in my book that would prove it, For instance; *That is the true light of Christ within.* Quest. *But if I should turn to it and obey it when it reproves me for sin, is there power in it to save me from my sin?* Ans. **ALL POWER IN HEAVEN AND EARTH IS IN IT,** Smiths Prim. p. 14. Again I will make you know that I the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, — am the true eternal God, and that there is no other can save beside me. — I will make you new Creatures, if you will hearken unto me and obey me the light in you, G. Fox Junior. *And they that are false ministers, preach Christ without,* Smith. Let him deny these to be true Quakers if he dare. These I quoted in my book, yet could Pen say I thought to be believed hand over head. I say no more but *Oportet — esse memorem.*

## CHAP. II.

**H**E begins his Chapter with maiming my account of Christianities and Quakerisms coming into the world. p. 14. he attempts to excuse Burrough's phrase from blasphemy. *Viz. Your imagined God beyond the Stars.* But how? They were expressed of peoples imagining him to be in the likeness of man, and so denying his omnipresence that he should not be below as well as above. A rare excuse that denies Christs manhood! and making the man Christ Jesus, in whom the fullness of the God-head dwells bodily, to be a Popish ubiquitary.

The

§ 2. The next thing he would have you believe is, that the miracles wrought to confirm the Doctrine of the Scripture did confirm theirs. *SEE the wickedness of this spirit which works against us, unless we will work miracles to confirm that doctrine in this Generation which was confirmed 1600 years ago, &c.* This is a bold begging the question. Observe also, he implies they could work miracles if they would. But alas they must be such then as are *inspired* (as Fox saith) and it would be a miracle indeed, if they (as he saith) should become *signs and wonders to the world.*

§ 3. But p. 15. He tells you of the companions I rendered Quakerism to be attended into the world with; and adds *And what else John Faldo's devil pleases.* Yet instead of denying what I said (except the Epithets) he thus excuseth it. *Finally, did not the Devils howl, and roar, and tremble foreseeing they should be dislodged by one stronger than themselves? ——— and was their no terror in all this?* Yes verily; And moreover, whereas people have taken the Quakers to be possessed of th devil when so behaving themselves, Mr. Pen hath here confessed they were not mistaken. And more than that too, that they themselves were devils, for it was they that roared &c.

§ 4. He cavils p. 18. at my date of Christianity; And that he might taste the sweet revenge of fasting absurd consequences and contradictions upon me: that which I said *not* to be my opinion, he will needs have mine: and what I said we *all* agreed in, he leaves out altogether. Such faults he often commits which an honest Boy of twelve years old that can but write and read would not, could not be guilty of. But p. 19. he is gone beyond all bounds of truth and modesty. *But* (saith he) *that he may be further kind to us he proceeds.* *The Disciples were called Christians at Antioch Acts 11. 16.* Here he

he maims the text, and cuts off that leg on which my argument stood strong and upright. He leaves out the word *first* viz. *first at Antioch*. He proceeds in the same crooked steps in reporting my own words: *But the thing Christianity might well be before the name Christian*; here he leaves out *so short a space*: (which words next followed in my book) and then he insults; *Enough for us sober Reader to defend our first Chapter*. A man of a seared conscience! that can call it enough for him to defend a bad cause with, if he can but maim the Scripture and his adversaries words: which any man may do who regards not his reputation with God nor wise men, 'tis pitty any reader should be so tame to be thus imposed on.

When *Pen* was rebuking one he calls an Apostate from them, he thought my first Christians rightly plac'd; *That singular spirit of the bat getting place with some, and secret rents divisions and animosities being like to ensue amongst us, as among the first CHRISTIANS*. Who these first Christians should be except those in the Apostles time, let *Pen* tell us when he can; in the mean time I have his verdict against himself.

§ 5. I undertook to prove Quakerism no Christianity, from the confessed newness of it by their own party. *Pen* tells you p. 21. the first letters of the names of some, the bare names of others whose words I quoted: but dare not transcribe their words, being so fair to my purpose: only a part of *Penningtons* who saith of the Quakers dispensation, that it swallowed up even that of *Christ, and the Apostles*; which *Pen* would take off by telling me I have no Candour in so construing the words; as if *Pennington* who was a Schollar could not express his mind congruously, but must have *Pen* to be his interpreter.

Enough of this; I hasten to the point of the Scripture which will be more material.

CHAP. III.

**P**Age 24. *I found this to be the up shot, that the Quakers deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God; therefore they de y them altogether: Whence I take good heart to shew his ignorance, or great dishonesty.* This is not the first Cordial Mr. P you have made of a wilful untruth, nor yet the last by a great many. And you who summed up nine Arguments of mine more, which were the Contents of the nine Chapters next following, should have been ashamed to call this one, which was the first of ten the up-shot; and then insult. But I shall try how you break this single Cord, this one of ten.

§. 2. That you deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God you grant; but you say, p. 25. *I do declare to the World, that we own them to be a Declaration of the Mind and Will of God, in and to those Ages in which they were written.* With many other things, which I have shewed to be short of the main ends of the Scriptures: and you undertake not to disprove them. P. 25. he says, *I shall easily grant, that one word may stand representative of many.* An odd phrase that represents him not able to express himself congruously. I have heard of persons, as Parliament-men, and some Clergy-men, Representative of many persons; but never of a representative word before. But since they are erecting a Body Representative of all the Quakers, we may have them adding some words to be Representatives of all the rest. But here he contradicts F. Hewgil, who wonders at our ignorance, in calling many sentences by one word, p. 22. of my Book. But W. P. being more learned, his light is better than F. Hewgil's: but both together far from infallible.

B

§. 3.

¶ 3. P. 26. But says our Adversary to this Argument, *The Word was God; therefore the Scriptures cannot be the Word, because they are not God.* Let me tell you, that the Scriptures may be the Word, and Christ the Word also; and yet though Christ be the Word of God, the Scriptures the Word may be quite another thing than Christ: This he calls shameful arguing. And again, *I think it is as good sense, for my part, to call a Kings Letters, King.* But by your favour Mr. Pen, it is neither non-sense nor bad sense to call the Kings Letters the word of the King. But you consider not my Arguments, no not one of them; but jumble together some single words out of four pages, to make up three lines after your own fashion, and then dishonestly enough call them mine. Among others, I told you, that Christ call'd his Disciples the *Light of the World*, Mat. 5. 14. and he calls himself the *Light of the World*, John 8. 12. He that cannot hence perceive, that the same appellation may be given to divers things in a different sense, is not hugely provided to be an Answerer, the part you undertake.

¶ 4. But p. 27. he hath a Learned Defence: *Neither is there any other Word than Christ, with respect to that for which he is so stiled, to wit, Gods living powerful Word; and this decides the Controversie, and plainly adjudges us the matter against the utmost force of our Adversary.* Here he delivers up his Weapons, runs away, and cries Victory, I told him plainly enough, that we did not take the Scriptures to be the Word of God, in the same sense as Christ is; shewing also in what sense Christ is the Word, as the Scriptures are not: But he has no mind to examine that. Yet he turns again to have our pull with my main strength: the issue of which carries the Cause, if nothing else were debated.

¶ 5. P. 27. But he further says, *that the Word of God is so expressed in Scripture, as it must needs be understood*

not of Christ, but of the Scriptures. Here Mr. P. you are at falsifying your Author again, my words were [the matter contained in the Scriptures] but you would fain have your Readers believe, we understand by the Scriptures nothing but the Letter or Writings. Let us now see how you come off from my Scripture instances. To *Exod. 19. 20.* *1 Sam. 19. 27.* you say, it was meant of the Living Word that spake through those Servants of the Lord: But mistrusting this Reply as too weak, your refuge you run to is worse, p. 28. *Those two passages in Exod. and Sam. concern only particular cases, at a time when not a third part of the Scriptures were written, as our Adversary will confess.* But were not those Scriptures from the same God of Truth, as the rest? And I might add, that this proof is the more weighty: For if the matter contained in that part of the Scripture be called the Word of God, how much more worthily may the whole Body of them now extant be called by that Name.

§. 6. To that Text, *the cares of the world choak the Word, and it becometh unfruitful;* you say, p. 28. *it may be rightly understood of that Truth which Christ the Word Livingly sows in the hearts of men and women: the word of advice, reproof, instruction, is called the Word of God.* Here you have yielded the Cause, to save Christ from being the choaked and unfruitful Word. I am glad the Rack will extort from you an acknowledgment of the truth. You think you have sufficiently taken off *Eph. 6. 17.* from my service: *The Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God:* But I gave you the Greek in the Margin, ὁ ὅτι πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, a word which I presume you know cannot be understood of Christ.

§. 7. Two other Scriptures I quoted, between those you take notice of: *And Peter remembered the Word of the Lord, how he said unto him; before the Cock's crow &c.*

Luke 26. 61. and that it was not Christ the Word, but his saying; you have Gods Word for it. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said to him, Mark 14. 2. *I am against the Prophets that steal my word every one from his Neighbour*, Jer. 23. 30. Can Christ be stoln, as Laban's Idols were? But that you may not be brought to confessing the truth again, you give not one list at these Mill-stones.

§. 8. You tell us p. 20. of an absurdity that follows on our Principle, viz. *Then the Word of God could grow old, decay, be lost, misread, corrupted, transcribed, reprinted.* What then? Did we hold as you, that it is to be understood of no other but Christ, it would be an absurdity; but upon our principles none at all. Will you say that Scripture is absurd? *For we are not as many which corrupt the Word of God*, 2 Cor. 2. 17. Many did so, and many do so still; of whom you are a Ring-leader. Let me now ask you again, if Christ can be corrupted? if not, somewhat else beside Christ is in the Scripture called the Word of God: And you ought to have considered, that I told you, p. 20. that by the Scripture we mean the sense and matter therein expressed, containing those Histories, Prophecies, Promises, Threatnings, Doctrines, Exhortations, &c. which God at sundry times, and in divers manners revealed to, and spake by his Son, and Servants inspired by God, &c. This would have saved them at least from Fire, Water, Vermin, the dangers you talk of.

§. 9. You tell us p. 30. that I *object the Scripture will then lose their Authority with people, in case they should not be so acknowledged.* Very true, they would, and so. But you do ill to call it my Objection, for it is but a part of one of the many Arguments I produced, to prove that they that deny the Scripture to be the Word of God, deny the Scripture. To which Ar-

gument



guments by me insisted on, you have not one word to say.

CHAP. IV.

Page 32. he begins his Chapter thus; *His fourth Chap.— endeavours to prove, that we equal our writings and sayings with the Scriptures, and prefer them before the Scriptures.* Let us see now how this Combatant maintains *this* pass. The means I used for confirming the first part of this Charge were two, as he acknowledges, p. 35. First, their pretending them to be from the immediate inspiration and revelation of the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles, &c. This he is so far from denying, that he pleads for it; but after such a rude impertinent manner, that I should but injure you, and shew my self idle, to transcribe and animadvert upon it.

§. 2. My next proof is from their pretended infallibility in their writings and sayings. This he denies not to be their pretence, but would make it very necessary; yea, he takes it to be so far from a reproach to them to have such a conceit of themselves, that he casts the contrary Opinion again, and again, and again too, as dirt in my face: *This is your fallible, errable, uncertain* John Faldo. P. 38. he seems as if he would come to the shock: *And for equaling our writings with the Scriptures, because we assert Inspiration; and that what we have received and do declare of the things of God, is from the revelation of his Spirit in our hearts, it is a foolish inference.* He should have said the immediate revelation, as the Apostles and Prophets; but to leave out this is treacherous dealing, but very common with

W. B.

§.3. But how doth he come off from the consequence of this pretended Inspiration, and prove my reasoning foolish? Truly by as strange a way of arguing as ever you heard of: *Truth was and is Truth all the world over, and there was and is but one way to come to it in all Ages, I mean Inspiration.* This is laying a mans self flat on his back, to overthrow his Adversary, (but I am not so blind to stumble at him.) For first, he doth here deny the Scriptures to be any way by which to come to truth; for if there be but one way, and that be Inspiration, according to the Question, then the Scriptures cannot be any way, no not a subordinate way. Secondly, he tells you of the oneness of the way Truth is come by in all Ages; and if this be not equaling their writings with the Scriptures so far, it is because they are more than like, even the self-same. Yet he goes on with like strength in the next words: *The Scriptures are true, and our writings are true; but will it therefore follow that we bring them upon a vie? Is this your Disputant!* What to say to the last words, viz. his insult; I confess I know not at present, there is so much strength of Argument in them: but for the rest, I care not if I undertake to shew their vanity to Mr. Pen's face. If I had told you that your Coach makes a noise, especially when your Coach-man drives hard on London stones, or rough way; and then have told you, that you allowing this saying to be truth, you did thereby equal it with the Scriptures, for they are truth also; then, I say, you had certainly foiled me.

§.4. But Mr. Pen, you know that I go about to prove it by your equalling your writings, &c. with the most excellent and purely divine way by which the Scriptures were dictated; if you can find any higher, I shall then allow you do not equal them. But further, say you, *Cannot one man be another mans Brother, and not the El-*

*der Brother?* This hath done your work, or all hope is lost; and you put this saying in different Letters, as being extraordinarily to the purpose. Well then, it seems the Scriptures and your writings may without offence call one another Brother, yet not be thought to aspire to equality: But why? because forsooth, you do not say they are the Scriptures Elder Brother; or as you phrase it afterwards, *put your selves upon comparison with the Ancients*. Yet I always thought till now, that *Brethren* had been a term of equality; and that although in humane births there is a natural right to the first-born above the rest; yet in the productions of the Scriptures, in point of time, the New Testament, though born into the world last, may be every way equalled with the Old for excellency, yea, and excel it in glory also.

§ 5. Next, he propounds a Riddle to me to puzzle me, which, I think, would pose all men living thorowly to expound; viz. *He should first have proved, if he could, (that's well put in) what power God gave to the Ancients, and what to us; how much of his Spirit to those Ages, and what to this, or else he looseth himself*. But this he knows I cannot perform, and I confess it; therefore he falls on us all together with this down-right blow, seeing we are no better at argument: *But to think to run us down by exalting them [the Scriptures] or to lessen what we are by increasing their praise, is an old Artifice of the Devil*.

§. 6. There are in my Book two arguments, to prove they prefer their writings and sayings above the Scriptures. The first is, they pretend that it is God in them essentially considered, from whence issues their sayings and writings, p. 49. but this P. saith not one word to. My second is, their characters they give of their own writings and sayings, p. 45. some of these he attempts

to reconcile (as he calls it) but to what I know not: My first instances concerning the Scriptures are, *Feeding death with death: The Letter which killeth.* Of their own sayings, *The voice of the Son of God was utter'd forth by him, by which the dead was raised.* Of the Scriptures, *Seeking the living among the dead.* Of their own sayings, *His words ministred grace to the hearers.*

G. . P. 9. Reconciliation. Death is a *flat* without the living experimental knowledge of God, and his work in the heart; and that state will talk of the same of wisdom, as saith the Scripture: And that from the Scripture, that is, from or in the words of Scripture, being ignorant of the true sense of the Scripture.—Which literal knowledge it feeds upon, and contents it self with. Thus much to the first.

Here you have his sense of the death that is fed, and the death that feeds it: Death is a state,—and that state will talk too, &c. Here Mr. Pen hath forgot his traditional read knowledge and education, I am perswaded. I see he is like, in a short time, to arrive to as perfect and pure non-sense as G. Fox himself: I wish W. P. and all the rest of them, would hold their tongues and pens till their state talk, and then we should have very silent, still, and innocent discourse. But he fathers this tolly on the Scripture, and that is impious, *as saith the Scripture.*

But farther, he still supposes we must be ignorant of the true sense, unless we have such a Revelation as they talk of: but at least, that literal knowledge being fed on with content, is a deadly thing: for feeding on literal knowledge, if he mean on the knowledge that there are such Letters, and so disposed in the Bible, I believe he will find few guilty; if he mean feeding on what those Letters so disposed express as their sense, it is a high mistake to call feeding on that, feeding death with

with death; for it is not feeding on what we know that is so dangerous, but not feeding on it.

Yet let us see if his Exposition of the next phrase will give any more light: *The Letter killeth, that is, literal knowledge (or rather their imaginations from the Letter, not being divinely inspired so as to understand it) by which men bury and lift up themselves as Christians, &c.* I had thought knowledge and understanding had not been so opposite; but he corrects it, *imaginations not being inspired*, let the thing it self be ever so true: but it is no small impiety to charge mens Souls miscarrying on the knowledge the Letter of the Scriptures by Gods blessing conveys. St. Paul's corruptions made ill use of his Revelations, 2 Cor. 12. 7. The fault was not in his Revelations, but himself: yet I dare say, not one of you will say or write of your Revelations, (as you call them) as you do of the Scriptures, viz. the Revelations that kill: though those conceits have unmanned thousands, unchristian'd more.

But before the Gentleman hath concluded his Reconciliation, he (though I suppose never intending it) grants me the main thing contended for. P. 10. *Nor is there any comparison betwixt reading what Gods Spirit requires, and immediate hearing his Voice, and being sensible of his present living touches upon the Soul: writings are but holy things at second hand; a living Ministry is the very life, power, and spirit present, and more immediate.* Their writings and sayings they pretend to be perfectly immediate from the Spirit of God; but the Scriptures were handed through many Ages, and by many hands successively to us; and therefore he tells you there is no comparison, because he affirms theirs are more immediate.

§. 9. P. 12. He undertakes to put this good face on their foul dealing. Their saying of the Scriptures,

1b38

that light is in the Scriptures, prove that, or tell me what one Scripture hath light in it. The Title of a Quakers Book, *Light risen out of darkness. Reconcil.* There is not light in the Scriptures, that is, there is not living, spiritual, essential light in the Scriptures. Did he not intend his writings for the view of those only, who understand right reasoning no more than a Horse doth Hebrew, he could not expect any success in such pitiful attempts: *Whatsoever makes manifest is light*, saith the Scripture; but if there be no light but according to the characters he gives, Candles, Stars, Moon, Sun, Reason, and *W. P.* writings also, are gross perfect darkness. And yet he tells you of the Author of the Quakers book, *He writ his book, to give notice of the day-spring of Gods eternal light of life to the world*, i. e. the light within, that needed the light of *Farnsworths* book to be seen by: What cannot such a Reconciler do!

§. 10. He concludes thus, p. 43. *So that our Adversaries Argument amounts to thus much; they therefore prefer their own writings before the Scriptures, because they in all their writings earnestly endeavour, by numerous Quotations, to prove what they write to be according to Scripture. Behold Reader how at one blow we fall! the whole Chap. of this fallible, errable, uncertain, busie Priest. &c.* I leave it to my Reader to give a name to this passage, the like to which, for a daring untruth, the world hath scarcely been ever acquainted with; yet the man pretends, beside all other Graces, to infallibility; and I could, as to their praise of quoting Scripture, produce many a large Libel of the Quakers, where there is not one quotation of Scripture. Among others, *W. Smith* whom I often quoted in *Quakerism no Christianity*, in his Book that pretends to be a Directory for Religious Principles, consisting of above 200 pages, hath not one Scrip-  
ture

ture quoted, not one Exhortation to read the Scriptures; but as its main scope, denies and throws dirt upon them.

§. 11. P. 42. He exclaims against my inferences, and p. 41. grants their grounds: *Only (his much I will say, that though all ability was and is in him the Light, who we declare to be the Light of all (yea all in common) mankind, to reveal the whole mind of God, &c.* Yet he tells me, p. 45. that *I so basely mistake Reason, and abuse my Reader, as to infer from the ability of the light (whether they'd or disbel'd) (which were no words of mine) the usefulness of Scripture.* But how can we know any thing the better for *W. P.*'s. hard names he puts on it, seeing there is nothing that pinches him, but he hath presently a hard name for it; and so impertinently and slovenly imposed, that a man might learn far more gentile railing under a hedge. *Base comparison*, p. 43. *Black as bell in malice*, p. 46. *The impudence of his wickedness*, p. 49. *This is your infalible, errable, busie Priest*, &c.

But to return to my Charge; Doth he not say the same thing himself of the sufficiency of the light in every man? And I am sure that what is added to sufficient is superfluous, especially when that excludes any thing else as means: And he might have read my proof out of their great Author, in his *Lip of Truth opened*, p. 45. *Light is the same in him that hates it, and in him that loves it.* It becomes *W. P.* and all the rest who are of his pretences, to be ashamed of their Tenets, that bear by right reason such woful consequences, rather than to think to affright us like bruit beasts, or persons without use of reason, by meer noises, out-cries; and appeals, which are like the rumbling of a Hackney Coach, for an honest man and a rich to day, for a very beggar and a worse to morrow; if he please to be at the small cost.

¶ 12. He saith, p. 51. *For his comparison of us with the Quakers, we little regard it: He tells the world the Papists own Revelation, and the Quakers hold Revelation also; therefore the Quakers are Papists, or very near them.* How can I guide W. P's. pen to write truth in matter of fact? if he find such an argument in my book, I will be content to be his Bond-slave. My argument you may find, p. 55. First Part, of another countenance than this he gives you, and managed orderly to p. 65. Can you believe that man shall be blessed with Apostolical immediate Revelations, for every thing in Religion, that is not so honest as to use the light of the very eyes in his head? I proved moreover, the Quakers to have the two blackest marks of Antichrist upon them, but one wilful leasing at his entrance, saves him the trouble and danger of encountering those nine pages.

¶ 13. Among the multitude of my Quotations out of the Quakers Authors, he objects against three or four, as not rightly quoted in their words. I confess 'tis possible that in so many, one in a hundred may be so mistaken: Yet I so hate falsifying the words of an Author, that my care was doubled in that point; and those few P. objects particularly against, I shall bring them out to the least circumstantial word: And indeed I might have wrote only a leaf or two to vindicate from such objections, as a full Vindication; for if those Quotations be true, it carries the cause, and proves abundantly Quakerism to be no Christianity. My Animadversions on them are visible to every Reader that will to make his judgment of, whether genuine or not.

¶ 14. To Pennington's passage, p. 3. *My upright desire to the Lord for you is, that he would strip you of your knowledge of the Scripture according to the flesh.* He tells you my Exposition of their sense of knowledge according to the flesh: By flesh (says he) their sense is the use of our understanding.



understandings, (though sanctified) as will appear in the Key. For this he rates me most emphatically: but meer dirt will easily be wiped off. The words (though sanctified) I put in a Parenthesis, and another Letter, to note that they would not allow the word sanctified: though it is ealie to prove, that they account all their understandings, and the use of them *un-sanctified*, who are not Quakers, & it is no hard matter to prove that many whose understandings are not guided only by immediate motions and inspirations, which the Quakers make necessary to Sanctification, have yet sanctified understandings.

He saith, p. 41. *It is denied that ever any such words were spoken or written of the holy Scriptures, as pre. p. 1 and tradition of men.* I quote Smith Morning-Watch, p. 18. it should been p. 22. I quoted him for the same words p. 22. in the first part of my book, p. 119. And if Mr. Pen please, I will to his face and his freinds, shew this Author, and more of their very Chief who say the same. But what will not this man venture to deny, who will deny that ever any such words were written, *yes* or *spoken* of the holy Scriptures; either he must have a Key to all their mouths, that they might not speak without his knowledge and leave, or have an Ear like Gods, to hear all that is spoken; or he ventures so hard, as no wise man will venture a truth of any moment on his management.

## CHAP. V.

**T**He Charge in my fifth Chap. is, that the Quakers deny the Scriptures to be a rule of faith and life, or a Judge and Determiner of Religious Controversies: But P. as if he had sworn not to repeat my words faithfully,

fully, transcribes them, *That we deny the Scriptures to be a Rule of Faith, and Judge of controversies.* A few lines after, saith he, *He not only tells him that to deny them to be the Word of God, is a good reason why he should conclude us to deny them to be a rule;* (Not a word like it in my book; the man seems to write at all adventures) *but he suggests that we believe a conformity to their guidance, cannot render a prophane man less prophane.* False quoted again: My words were these; To little purpose will it be to call them the Scriptures, the holy Scriptures, &c. if after all, a conformity to their guidance and conduct, will render our belief and practise nevertheless prophane: So that I may take up *Jeremy's Lamentation; And they will deceive every one his Neighbour, and will not speak the truth: They have taught their tongue to speak lyes, and weary themselves to commit iniquity,* Jer. 9.5. Now what clearer consequence can there be than mine, holiness consisting in a conformity to the Law of God, or that rule of faith and life which he hath set before us.

Yet after all this patching, he yields my Charge to be their Principle, and pleads for it, p. 54. That which always was, and is a more general Rule than the Scriptures, must needs be, and is most properly the general rule, and not the Scriptures: but that was and is the light of God in the hearts of men, consequently not the Scriptures. Seeing the Gentleman dares to rally his argument in mood and figure, it ought by all means to have some notice taken of it. But Mr. P. I perceive is no Proficient in Logick, since I last spake with him: for first here he mistakes the question, and then all men that are Logicians know the argument must be thrown out of doors: I never affirmed them to be a general rule, nor is it that I charge the Quakers for denying, but I charge them with denying them to be any rule at all of faith and life, &c.

But

But if Mr. P. had adventured to oppose what I said in the fifth Chap. to prove the Scriptures not only to be such a rule, &c. as I affirmed, but also most suitable to the present state of man, and more certain to his knowledge than any other given from God in our days, what he had said should have been considered; but those were edge-tools.

§. 2. He saith, p. 55. that what I quoted out of *James Naylor*, was not written in derision of the Scriptures: viz. *God is at liberty to speak to his people by them [the Scriptures] if he please, and where they are given by inspiration he doth so; and so he is at liberty to speak by any other created thing, as to Balaam by his Ass.* But what will not he undertake to defend, that will attempt to clear this passage from contempt of the Scriptures? upon my quoting it, he tells his Reader, *in answer to all which he says just nothing*; as if I were to answer the proofs of my own affirmation: Yet if I had said I said nothing to it, to demonstrate it to be to my purpose, he had added falshood to his folly.

But how doth he bring it off from being a derision to the Scriptures? why, it was *to prove, that God is not limited to instruments.*

But by his favour, the Scriptures are Gods *standing Ordinance* for our rule, so is not an Ass. And although God is at liberty to speak by an Ass, it is more than Gods meer liberty to speak by the Scriptures; for it is his Ordinance: but according to *James Naylor*, to take an Ass or a Bible to be our instructor, is of equal prudence: For the Scriptures have nothing to say to us from God, if we receive them not by inspiration; and upon the same terms an Ass may be our Teacher. These notions being by the Quakers sucked in, I wonder not that they leave the teachings of God by the Scriptures, to attend on the Ministry of Asses.

*J. 2.* But page 58. he thinks he hath for ever undone my reputation as an Expofitor, even as much as I, and thousands more, believe his Answer hath undone his reputation for a Tell-truth. *And I cannot forbear at this time (though I have often done so) to shew the horrible perversion of Scriptures this man is guilty of, &c.* Now Reader, if ever you would know what the crimes are the man calls horrible, bend your attention: The Text is in *Acts 24. 16.* *And herein do I exercise my self, to have alway a conscience void of offence toward God, and toward men.* But where is the perversion? I refer, *Herein do I exercise my self, &c.* to the *all things which are written in the Law, and the Prophets.* But what is the perversion is P's. own words? *I do say this is a perversion of the Scriptures, for he hath first left out that which is more applicable to the words, and put that only in which is least so.* Next, he hath done it in the same Character, by which common Readers may mistakenly be strengthened against us. This is plain; indeed, very plain trifling: if it be at all applicable to the words (as he denieth not but alloweth) it is no perversion: *Parturiunt montes, &c.* Now you have the Mouse his Mountains were travelling to bring forth:

But that I put it in the Scripture-Character offend him greatly; why not? they are the words of the Scripture: Yet because they were not the next in order I put them within a Crotchet, thus; *Herein [all things &c.]* which method, all that understand writing, will approve as the most exact; but it seems P. is none of that number.

But further he tells you, *Nor is such a use of his words suitable to the condition Paul was in; for he having outstript both the Law and Prophets, and being brought to a brighter day, and more excellent dispensation, he cannot be so rightly said to have been exercised in that he had left be*

hind him: But if it were *rightly*, though not *so* rightly, where is my perversion? much less my horrible perversion of the Scriptures.

If St. Paul had undertaken a Reply to this Gentleman, he would undoubtedly have lashed him severely for this wrong done to him, and the truth; in saying, *He had out-stript the Law and the Prophets, and left them behind him.* But p. 60. he cries *Victoria*, as if I had cut off my own head with my own hands: But this is so common with him, and to so little purpose, that the wonder is over with me. Why I said the holy Scriptures determine according to their kind, as much as a *writing* can do, whether we believe or practise aright or not: From whence he infers, *that is not so determinative of all cases as something else may be, which is a more living, immediate, and infallible Judge, than a writing is or can be*: an inference worthy of a poor Scholar, and a conceited Pedant. Are writings such trivial things with him? is he gone beyond Belshazzar, who trembled at such a rate at the writing on the wall? Surely a writing from heaven, or the matter contained therein, being the Word of the Great God, is a sacred and effectual thing to all, but very hardened or deluded hearts. Did ever any man in his wits affirm the Scriptures to supply the room of eyes, skill to read, Understanding, Conscience, Reason, and the assistance of the Spirit of God? Are not these in my Book all made necessary to render the Scriptures such a Rule and Determiner? But there *may be* a way which God who is Almighty *can* find out, to gratify the Mr. P's. and the Quakers idle humour, to determine without so much ado: But God will be sought in his own way, and not in theirs, or W. Pen's.

J. 4. But he hath not done trifling yet; p. 61. *Neither is the Law the Judge; but there is a Judge who interprets and speaks from the fresh discoveries of his own reason,*

*reason, the meaning and intendment of those written Laws.* But Mr. Pen, the Judge is the Mouth of the Law, and subject to the Law, and prescribed in his judgment to that sense of the Law which is expressed by the Letter of it, and may be corrected, and ought to be by the Law; and when his judgment is given of the meaning of the Law, it is recorded in writing too, that it may not be corrupted. I suppose you will not now put *your* light into so mean a preferment as one of our living Judges of the Law: if some of the Judges had the handling of you, for imposing your Canting *fresh discoveries of his reason* upon them, they would tell you, they give judgment from a deep study, and weighty consideration of the Letter of the Law; and moreover, give you some hard names, or worse, for your Canting Law added to your Canting-Gospel; and yet the Light in their Consciences not give them the least rebuke for so doing.

To add to the measure of your iniquity, you make bold to mock God with an acknowledgment for his goodness, in opening his truths so clearly to you; and manifestly discovering the great darkness and blindness of *its Opposers.*

---

## CHAP. VI.

**M**Y Charge in my sixth Chapter was, that the Quakers take men off from reading the Scriptures and looking into them for instruction and comfort.

P. objects against my first proof, as not having any such consequence, p. 63. *And this is the meaning of our Doctrine, to bring people to the everlasting Word of God in themselves.* Smith Cat. p. 95. And that his Objection may smell intolerably strong, he very liberally, from

the abundance of his meekness and wisdom, bestows on me and my Conclusion these most courteous and civil Characters; and all within eight lines: *Deeply ignorant, malicious, ungodly, possessed by an evil Spirit, wretched, impious, grossly blind, malignity, frothiness, envy, impious injustice.* And then enquires of all men, *if it be a sin to bring people to the Everlasting Word of God in themselves.* Although P. page 9. of his Answer, challenges me to shew them (among other things) where any acknowledged Quaker calls the Light in every man very God, yet he doth here own it to be such himself; unless at the very moment of writing this passage, he did not hold the *Everlasting Word of God* to be Christ and God: But he being *omnium horarum homo*, you must expect him in any shape for the present turn, though it serve to delude only the most ignorant and forgetful.

Now the Quakers magnifying their light within to be no less than very God, and such a Word and Teacher as is the only Rule, Guide, &c. This must needs be the consequence, that the meaning of their Doctrine is to take people off from reading the Scriptures; yea, this *W. Smith*, whose words they are, is the man that in twenty places in his Book from whence that passage is taken, *viz.* his *Primer and Catechism*, shuts out the Scripture from being any Rule or Teacher at all.

§. 2. But p. 64. he fathers his Error on *Calvin, Erasmus, Beza*, thus: *I do affirm against this ungodly Priest, and that by Authority of God, Reason, and the first Reformers too, that no man on earth can understand them, but by being first brought to the Everlasting Word of God nigh in the heart.* He directs precisely only to *Erasmus and Beza*, in *Nov. Test.* 2 Pet. 1. 19. *Beza's* words on the place, which I have examined, are these: *Sic enim accipi potest, ut dicatur Petrus habuisse eorum rationem ad quos scribebat, apud quos Doctrina Prophetarum major erat omni*

exceptione. So it may be taken for the Doctrine of the Prophets, which was to those to whom Peter wrote, *without exception*; to whom he may be said to have a respect in this passage. Thus this man can abuse God, Scripture Reason, first Reformers, and all at once.

The next of my proofs he doth not, he dare not repeat in the Quakers words; but lames my quotation to make my consequence a Cripple. P. 65. *But he says that John Parnel censures such that draw peoples mind from the light within, to the light without, putting the Letter for the Light, &c. which, &c. you must not see by his leave.* What I quoted out of Parnel, was this to a tittle; *And by the same light do we discern, and testify against him to be in darkness, and is a Deceiver, who putteth the Letter for the Light; and so draw peoples minds from the light within them, to the light without them; SEEKING THE LIVING AMONG THE DEAD.* This needs no Comment to render its proof valid; and is out of the reach of the utmost stretch of P's. wit and confidence, to put any appearance of another construction upon it.

§. 3. Now, Reader, I am come to a passage which makes me conclude its Author desperate, a passage that renders him careless how justly odious he becomes with thousands, so he may but lessen the reputation of my Book, and the truth it pleads for with some: But *below us to pursue every advantage his ignorance gives us* I find him more in words than matter, a great deal; and suppose more are of that mind, or else what means his great pains to be made waste paper of already? **QUAKERISM NO CHRISTIANITY**, bath exchange'd the Book-seller's Stalls for the Tobacco-shops. Poor man! perhaps he will write another Book to complain of the deadness of Professors' hearts, that they make so ill use of the labours of pious Ministers: I am confident nothing but his fear of losing by



it, could divert him from such a lamentation. The man grows rotten ripe, there needs no shaking to make him fall: the acceptation my Book hath had in the world, becomes not me to express. The second impression of above 1250, (which the Press began with within six weeks of the first impression coming forth) I suppose may be abroad e're this come to thy hand, without fear of the fate of wast paper to the Tobacco-shops, from the Book-sellers stalls.

I cannot yet find by enquiry, that any of his Answers to my Book have come to the preferment of the Book-sellers stalls to adventure that passage, (the Book-sellers being most of them, if not all to a man, ashamed to expose such Trash.) If Mr. P. have any modesty left, he will avoid passing by the Book-sellers shops for some time, till this be forgotten, else 'tis a thousand to one but he will find them pointing at him, or more, for a Non-such ——— It may be for all this, W. P. or some Friends, to create matter for this reflection, did light Tobacco in the Tobacco-shops with some of my Books, though they paid the Book-seller as much for the Jest, as if they had used my Book as became it in good earnest. But if so, it is but like much more of the Quakers, a meer Cheat put upon the world; and such an one, as less wit will serve to lay the plot of, than wickedness to execute ——— *No fear of God before his eyes, for he flattereth himself in his own eyes, until his iniquity be found to be hateful: The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit; he hath left off to be wise, and to do good; he setteth himself in a way that is not good; he abhorreth not evil,* 1 Psal. 36, 2, 3, 4. But if it had been so, it had not been without good company in that bad event.

————— *Careat successibus opto:*

*Quisquis ab eventu facta notanda putat.*

## CHAP. VII.

**H**E begins his Chap. with falsifying his Authors words: Because the *Quakers deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God; therefore they deny them to all intents and purposes*: Which considered, he pretends himself not obliged to take notice of what I say farther, as he saith, *after such plentiful confutation*; which if he had not called by that name, no body that understands a Confutation, would have thought it like such a thing. He seems herein to imitate those skilful Painters, who having designed to paint a Horse, or a Bull, do it so unlike that they are constrained to write, this is a Horse, this is a Bull; that people might know what they meant by it. But being weary of this confusing work, and having yet so many irons in the fire; he tells you my reasons *seem to resemble the old way of two and twenty Beloved, to spin out the Hour-glass.*

§. 2. My Charge and Argument in this Chap. to prove that the *Quakers deny the Scripture*, is, The *Quakers affirm the Doctrines, Commands, Promises, Holy Examples, expressed in the Scriptures as such, not to be at all binding to us*: Such an Argument, and so proved by me, as a thousand Pen's can never invalidate. But let us see how he goes to work.

He undertakes one of my proofs, among many, which I quote out of E. Burrough: *That is no Command of God to me, what he commanded to another; neither did any of the Saints, which we read of, act by that Command which was to another, not having the Command to themselves, &c.* To this saith P. I answer briefly and plainly; and he is as good as his word: *No Command (saith he) in the Scripture is any further obliging upon any man, then as he finds*

a Conviction upon his Conscience; otherwise men should be engaged without, if not against Conviction: a thing unreasonable in a man; that is, they are no Commands unless we think so. 'Tis no sin to break all the Commands in the Bible, if our Consciences can but be so blinded or hardned, as not tell us 'tis a sin. They who thought they did God good service in killing his servants, did not sin in the least, because they were not convinced of a Command to the contrary; nor the Idolaters in the case of *Baal*, because they thought *Baal* to be a God indeed. This Answer of *Pen's* is enough.

§ 3. To vindicate my whole Charge concerning the Scriptures, 'tis a principle that hath all iniquity in the Womb of it: You may see one Monster it bears in his argument he backs it with; *Therefore the Apostle when he wrote to the Churches, exhorted them not to do those things whereof they were ashamed.* A strange metamorphosing that Text, *Rom. 6. 21.* But sure the conviction of sin was the cause of the shame the Apostle speaks of; therefore it was sin before they were convinced or ashamed of it. But the scope and drift of *P's.* argument is, if men be not ashamed of sin upon conviction, it is no breach of a Command that hath any obligation or authority on them. Who can find names for such impious principles? *Pen* hath opposed, scorned the truth, vilified its Teachers and Defenders, so as scarce never man did: vented the most pernicious Errors, told a abundance of those things that are known to himself to be false, and all in this his pretended Answer: But if we have Brow enough to defend him from conviction that they are sin, they are no sin by his own Tenet; and I never yet met with his Fellow for that piece of Arraignment.

§ 4. I have read of one who going stark naked, and being rebuked for the same; replied, you go with

your faces and fore-heads naked, and I am all for head. The Ranters, of whom the Quakers are but the out-sidely refined, upon this Tenet exercised themselves in all impiety, that custom might harden them against shame and conviction; which when arrived at in the height, they accounted themselves perfectly sinless, because perfectly shameless. But if they are no command but upon conviction, how dare he vilifie me as such an ungodly sinner, who am so far from being under conviction, that I have done ill in putting out my Book that my Conscience would have Chid me if I had omitted it. If this will not render Quakerism hateful, and put people at the greatest distance from its temptations, must conclude they are senseless and desperate.

¶ 5. He proceeds to oppose my Charge of the denying the Scriptures to be any means to know God Christ, or our selves: He gathers, as he thinks, some strength from the vote of their practice, p. 14. *For they be bad both cut off all benefits that could accrue to people by his Books, and also from that Ministry God had given him to profit others with.* This might look like an argument for his meaning, if it concerned almost any but the Quakers, who assert nothing almost but with a contradiction and agree in nothing, but not to side with the truth. I should think it as hard a task to reconcile the Quakers to themselves, as to make the Poles to meet, or dig through the earth with a Spade to the Antipodes. There are many testimonies I produced to prove my Charge, which he cares not to deal with, or bring to the light. Take two of them: *They are such people as tell the world that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, are the Gospel; they are but the letter; Paper sent, &c. page 2. And the knowledge of the Languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which they call the Original, is nothing worth, as pertaining to the knowledge of God; John Higgins Warning, p. 7.*

CHAP. VIII.

**M**Y Charge in this Chap. pretended to be answered by *W. P.* is, that the Quakers affirm the Scriptures to be no means whereby to resist temptation, and that they are dangerous to be read. He passes over no less than six Testimonies without a word to invalidate them. Among the rest this, *If you use any other weapons than [the light within] in this spiritual war, you cannot prosper nor prevail against him [the Devil.]* So I more than proved my assertion: For to be a hindrance, and such an one as would mar the whole business, is much more than to be no furtherance.

§ 2. The first thing he deals with, is a passage of James Naylor's: *For those only are the Children of God, who are led by the Spirit of God, to whom they who were led by the Letter were ever enemies.* From whence, saith Pen, he concludes, that we account it a very dangerous thing to read the Scriptures. Now if this passage hath any relation to his charge or conclusion, no man ever saw the like. He should have added, that was always stark blind: But 'tis a sign his judgment is very feeble, that could not or would not know, that it is dangerous to be led by the Letter, and consequently to read them to that end, if they that were so led were ever Enemies to the Children of God: But if *P.* account it no evil to be an Enemy to the Children of God, we shall without his leave be of another Opinion.

§ 3. My quotation out of *W. P.* Spirit of Truth, &c. and Comment, he is much concerned about, as that which touched his own self to the quick. His words which I quoted are these: *But I will assure them they shall grope in the dark, till they come into the daily obedience*

ence of the light, and there rest contented to know only as they experience: and not from a ravening comprehending brain, that would in its unregenerate state grasp at the clear Mysteries of the Kingdom, into which fleshly comprehensions and notions can never enter: but all must be *unlearned* from their first birth, education, and traditional read knowledge, as he is *unman'd* that is again become a little Child, before the secrets of Gods work come to be made known. But how comes he off? E'n with Club-argument, p. 79. As it is impious and unchristian in John Faldo, to assert the right knowledge of God obtainable any other way than by experience. Reader, you have his Character of asserting, that Reason, Faith, Scripture, yea the Spirit of God too, (all which are not one and the same thing with experience) are any means by which to obtain the right knowledge of God. Again, saith he, *They dread the consequence of having their literal knowledge laid aside*; and so doth every true Christian.

But W. P. adventures to reconcile all that can be objected to his notions; he that will know how, let him throw away 18 d. on his Book for me.

J. 4. To the last part of his saying, *All must be unlearned from their first birth, education, and traditional read knowledge, &c.* and my Comment on it. He pleads his Vindication by an Appeal, p. 85. *How could he think that I should speak so reverently of the Scriptures, and quote them diligently, and very often to the proof of my assertions; and yet mean nothing less abusive of them than his untrue consequences?* Truly Mr. Pen, you must be content your meanings should be measured by the true import of your words, or you had better not presume to be a Writer; the latter of which would be a wise choice, till your Cause will bear better Pleas: but for your speaking reverently of the Scriptures, it may be sometimes as *argumentum ad hominem*, to delude people

into

into a belief that you reverence them; and to the same end you quote the Scriptures, which to you is no proof at all without immediate inspiration; and that will do as well without, or contrary to the Scriptures.

If appealing must decide the Controversie, I will deal with you at those weapons sufficiently to your confusing. How can any think, that you speaking so irreverently of the Scriptures, as to say, *They are not obliging, unless upon conviction*, p. 70. 73: *This chokes* John Faldo, and the rest of his partners — *who dread the consequence of having their literal knowledge of the Scripture laid aside*, p. 79. who undertakes by all your skill to defend such who say, *the Scripture hath no light in it*; that compare its Authority with an Ass; that call it the *Carnal Letter*, *Dead Letter*, p. 39. who your self reproach those who dispute from the Scriptures, as *dry cavilling Letter-mongers*; Spirit of Truth, &c. who attempt to vindicate G. Fox in corrupting the very Text of the Scripture; Spirit of Truth, &c. who quote them so diligently your self, that you frequently lame them of what serves to your Adversaries purpose: corrupt them, by altering both words and sense of the Text most frequently; frame words of your own, put them into the Scripture-Letter; and then add, as saith the Scripture, *cum multis aliis*. I say, how can any sober person think you mean any thing less than my true consequences?

§. 5. He thinks he has me upon the hip, page 87. for saying the God above, and the Scriptures without, have taught us better things: *If it be in the Scriptures, it was imperinent to say any more than that the Scriptures have taught*, &c. but if he meant that God taught by his immediate discoveries with and beside the Scriptures, then wherein do we differ? This phrase he calls assisting to my own Confutation: If joyning the Teachings of God and the Scriptures alway together, be Self-confutation,

tation, let me ever be so confuted : but so long as I do so, I am safe enough from being a Quaker.

P. 88. He quarrels with my management of Eph. 6. 16, 17. *And a shame it is that this man should bring these places to prove, that the Scriptures are means whereby to resist temptation.* The words are; *Wherefore take unto you the whole Armour of God.* And among the rest is reckoned *the Sword of the Spirit, which is the WORD of God.* Why doth he not say 'tis a shame I produce any Scripture at all? which is like a Quaker thorowly; but the matter is, 'tis a shame to call the Scriptures the *Word of God, or the Spiritual Sword.*

Once more, and I have done with this Chapter: But *said Christ to the Devil, it is written, What then? therefore must the Quakers needs deny the Scriptures to be any means to resist temptation, p. 90.* You may fear the man is crazed, or was almost asleep when he wrote this; or intended to render me as impertinent as himself, that we might cry quits. I produced the example of Christ to prove that the Scriptures are a means for resisting temptation; he resisting so effectually with, *it is written, it is written.* A most pregnant proof: But P. would make you believe I intended it to prove, that the Quakers deny the Scriptures to be such a means. Can you think such a man to be sinless, yea infallible?

But he begins to be a little more awake in the next words, seeming to hear what I said and meant; or rather *are they not such means when God is pleased to use them.* All this ado to make the Scriptures nothing without immediate inspiration. But Gods using, or blessing rather of a means, makes it an effectual means; yet if God have fitted and ordained it a means, it is a means though it reach not the end; yea, the Scriptures are such a means whereby to resist temptation, that if we use them faithfully, God will bless them with efficacy.



CHAP. IX.

**T**HAT the Quakers put the Spirit of God, and the Scriptures, in opposition to each other, is my Charge. Two of my Testimonies he objects against: For the first, he appeals to God, Heaven, Earth, and my own Conscience, that *Smith* said not what I charge him with of the Scriptures, and the Doctrines received from thence. But, saith P. *What W. Smith said, reflected not in the least upon the Scriptures, nor those Doctrines which were TRULY received thence; no such words can be produced by our Adversaries.*

No Jesuite in the world did ever out-do *W. P.* in Equivocations and Subterfuges, with which those who are not well acquainted with his Tenets, may be easily deluded: His great stress lies on the words, *truly received thence; they allowing no Doctrine to be truly received from the Scriptures, but such as is received by immediate inspiration, and not from the Authority of the written Word. And whereas he saith, no such words can be produced; he intends no other, but that S. doth not accuse himself in so many words of blaspheming the Spirit of God in the Scriptures, and the Doctrines from thence received.*

§. 2. But that all that inventory of execrable names *W. S.* doth intend of the Scriptures, and the holy Doctrines grounded on the Authority of the written Word, take these Testimonies: John 1. 9. *He [John] beheld him and his glory, and felt his power, and what his power took away: Then he declared him as he knew him, and not from any Tradition or writing before him. Why then do you teach for Doctrines mens Traditions? — running into the lines of what others have written.* Morning Watch, p. 6.

*And*

## Quakerism no Christianity.

And they ordain Elders, and Deacons, and Officers, in their order and practise, having read of such names in the Scripture: And they contend against Pope, &c. — and yet in the ground one: for the Presbyters branch is from the same root, and his Birth conceived in the same Womb with the Popes and Prelates, p. 20. And reading in the Scriptures, that there were some who met together, and exhorted one another, and were edified and comforted one another: they observe, and do as near as they can, what they read of the Saints practise; and so conceive a Birth in the **SAME WOMB**, and brings it forth in the same strength as others do; and in the ground it differs not, p. 22. This follows in this, and p. 23. all that Rabble of vilifying expressions, of both their practises and authority, quoted by me in *Quakerism no Christianity*, p. 119. All this Pen knew to be true, when he dared to make such hypocritical Appeals to delude the world, save the Quakers credit, and abuse me as a Forger.

§. 3. The next Testimony he attempts to take off p. 95. is this: *O<sup>r</sup> this sort are the false Prophets, who have their preaching from study, and other mens mouths:* Here he treacherously leaves out, *or from the Letter, and not from the mouth of the Lord.* From whence he infers (saith Pen) that what we have in the Scriptures, is not from the mouth of the Lord. 'Tis false to say I infer so; for I infer that it is your error. Our meaning is still overlookt by this disingenuous Adversary, and a quite contrary thing substituted. I quoted Jer. 15. 19. *Thou shalt be as my mouth:* But hear his own exposition, and if it be not the same I both spake and intended; and also if it prove not my Charge with the clearness of Sunbeams, I will not undertake to read English. The natural purport of the words can be no more than this; that though the things declared of in the Scriptures were the Word of the Lord to the Holy Ancients, and Jeremy as

Gods

Gods mouth (*not his mouth therefore*) to the people Israel; yea, much of it the mouth of the Lord too us to; yet for men to say any part thereof by rote, especially if they add their own Comments and Glosses framed from study of any part of the Scripture, and cry, *Thus says the Lord*; or, *Hear the Word of the Lord*; and not in the SAME LIVING SENSE, NOR UPON THE LIKE COMMISSION: every such one doth rob his Neighbour, and steal his words.

1. 4. The Errours, Self-contradictions, and absurdities or *W. P.* here, I shall express briefly: what he saith they mean, I said they mean also; viz. the Scriptures are not the mouth of God. 2. He saith the *things* spoken of were the *Word* of the Lord; then the Word of the Lord is or was more than one; a contradiction to himself. 3. That God hath a mouth in a proper sense, *Jer. AS his mouth* (*not his mouth therefore.*) 4. What the Scriptures say, the Lord does not say; unless he that utters them have the like Commission from God as *Jeremy*. 5. That all that call them by that name, and do tender them to others, are Thieves and Robbers. 6. That *Jeremy*, and the Prophets, are our Neighbours, though dead two or three thousand years since. And to fill up the measure of this affront to the Scriptures, he tells us, p. 94. that such as have not received what they deliver from the immediate Word of God himself, i. e. the light within, is but a very Babler, and begets people no further than into meer words. If so, never any were converted to God, nor born again by the Ministry of any persons from the Scriptures.

P. 5. Upon their charging us with Idolatry; I being so unhappy as to say, and now I am come to the highest round of their Ladder. Upon the conceit of the Ladder, P. is got into a frolick, and will needs turn Hang-man to his Adversary, having no better opportunity

nity to have his will of him : p. 95. *I will not say he often, nor for what an Army-Chaplain might deserve to be highly exalted ; but since his eager pursuit after an innocent people hath brought him actually thither, and it falls my share to be his Executioner, I shall take all the care can to acquit my self well of the imployment : I will warrant him for ever coming down the same way he went up. And thus (says he) p. 100. is he fairly turned off — and as it fares with some notorious Malefactors, remains there pendent, i. e. hanging.*

§. 6. I must be so ingenuous as to acknowledge, he hath shewed more skill abundantly in this Hang-man part, than in the part of an Answerer. I am persuaded he hath studied the point hard, and how he would deal with his Adversaries, had he the handling of them. For you must not suppose the Gentleman had all this by immediate inspiration ; though the Body of the Quakers, and their light in them, will vouch this infallible Stager was no worse qualified here, than in his most serious Appeals ; which I do verily believe to be true.

§. 7. But why an Army-Chaplain deserves the preferment more than a Military Sea-Captain ? his Father's Character ? Why his Father got an estate by it, and left it to a Son likely enough to bewray his own Nest ; and hath now proved no less graceless, and ungrateful. But an Army-Chaplain (as he thinks) hath greatly disturbed him in enjoying it in his Quakers Kingdom. And this Character will fit all the Non-conformists, of whom he saith indifferently, p. 109. *their preach't up Bartels, Spoils, Plunders, Sacriledges, and what not.* So that he hangs us all alike, at once in a string, to shew what he means by the innocent people, who will at this time do us no more harm, because they cannot.

§. 8. I also acknowledge I am never like to come down

down the same way I went up, because that is to be done only by a Recantation. If I were so envious, I could also prove him a Bungler at this Hang mams work, in more particulars than one; and so unworthy even of that preferment: Yet I will not envy him the Office which pleases him so well, especially considering he hath no better than Ropes of Sand for execution, which will be very harmless either to causes or persons. Pardon me, Reader, if I have herein played the fool; I am constrained to *answer a Fool according to his folly.*

6. 9. Upon my affirming, that they charge it upon us as the sin of idolatry, to believe and live according to the instructions and holy examples expressed in and by the Scriptures, except we have them by immediate inspiration, &c. I produced, among others, two Testimonies, which he takes notice of. My first is out of *Morn. Watch*, p. 23. *And this is Babylon, the Mother of Harlots, to read and practise as the Saints did, and the Apostles in the Scriptures, &c. ] and the abomination of all uncleanneſs.* I will now add the reason he gives for such a Character; *And are all out of the life and power of God:* by which phrase, they intend immediate inspiration. This Pen calls, p. 96. *forgery in the abstract, as base, black, and dishonest, as man can be to man;* with a great deal more of the like reflection, and as truly applicable; but for that he makes no more conscience than the veriest ——— that hath got a bottomless stock of abusive language, and pours it out at all adventures on whoever displeases. I have already vindicated my self from applying that to one subject, intended of another, in this Chapter; and about the same Author, matter, and every page: And if Pen dare give me a meeting with impartial Judges, I will (if God permit) produce the Book, and prove it to his face.

The next Testimony is out of the same Book: So

## 46 Quakerism no Christianity

mongst the words you find how the Saints in some things walked, and what they practised; and then you strive to make that thing to your selves, and to observe and do it as near as you can; and here you are found transgressors of the just Law of God, who saith, *Thou shalt not make thy self any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing*. And it follows, *Now what difference is there in the ground betwixt you and the Pope, though in the appearance there seem to be so great a space: if this be no forgery, the other must be a true Charge.* But what saith Penitence this? p. 98. *I have been the more punctual in the recitation of this, that I might shew my Adversary I will be just to him, though he be most egregiously unmanly to us.*

§. 10. Then, by his own confession, he hath not been very punctual before: and in this very quotation, where in he pretends to be more than ordinarily punctual, he treacherously abuses me, and weakens my Testimony grossly. For, whereas the latter part of the quotation viz. *Now what difference is there in the ground betwixt you and the Pope, &c.* he makes to be my inference, and puts it in my Letter, which is the Quakers next following words and inference; and in my Book in the Quakers Letter.

And that you may see upon what grounds he builds his Ranting Charges, take his own words: *Take W. in his own sense and belief, and all is well: (that is, believe we are unregenerate, talk without experience, and without knowledge without immediate inspiration to be made Images;)* He intended, that all those real experiments of other persons unexperimentally talkt over by unregenerate spirits, can be no ways beneficial; nay, that what Ideas or notions they may have to themselves of the holy Ancient enjoyments, while altogether unacquainted with them, are but a kind of images; which their believing in, and bowing to as indispensable Gospel-truths, is to be reputed nothing better than Idolatry it self.

§. 11. Reader, you see his confession, and that out of *W. Pen's* pretended Answer. I have all along found enough to prove, what he so much condemneth in me to affirm : but if you observe the odd impertinency of the man, you will take little notice hereafter of the Quakers sayings or meanings against their Opposers. *W. Smith* speaks expressly of the Saints practices, and how they walked : But *Pen* gives his meaning to be about experiments and enjoyments. *S.* calls their *DOING* like them, as near as they can, Idolatry ; and *Pen* tells us his meaning is about talking over the Ancients enjoyments. I presume, without my pointing at them, thou wilt observe more ridiculous matter ; as believing in their experiments, bowing to them as in dispensible Gospel-truths, &c. Yet the man, while he thus runs away with his little Remains of Reason it self in a Rout, vaunts and Cackles like a Hen, ( which is his constant wont, when he hath laid a worse thing than an Egg ) and is not so out of heart, but he can cry out on his Adversaries arguments, All trash, all trash.

§. 12. Concerning my parallel between the Jesuites and Quakers, in their venom spit against the Scriptures, he hath thus little to say, p. 101. *It is ridiculous, and every way unworthy our notice ; a meer begging of the Question ; we can never allow of the comparison.* But why all this contempt ? since the Papists place the Rule and Judgment in a Pope, or General Council, and the Quakers in the Eternal, Unerrable, holy Spirit of God. The first is as laid ; the second is blasphemously false : for the Quakers call their light within, the Spirit of God ; which I have proved sufficiently to be a blasphemer of the Spirit of God, a sordid, sinful, corrupt, and ridiculous thing ; from which (as themselves aver) all their sayings and writings about Religious matters proceed : And the Papists say no less of their Pope and Council, viz. That

the Spirit is present in the Pope, at least with his General Council; and all their Determinations are therefore definitive of the sense of Scripture, and all Religious Controversies, and that infallibly.

§ 13. And now the Quakers must have all pretended from the spirit in any individual person or more, tried by the spirit in the Quakers Pope G. Fox, and his Ministry or Representative Body; wherein they Ape the Pope and his Council: such likenesses as may better be called Idolatry, and a breach of the second Commandment, than doing like the Saints, in their holy actions recorded in the Scriptures, which the Quakers call Idolatry, because making of likenesses to our selves. And that I say nor this to be their practice on meer report, take a little of what I find in the Copy of a Manuscript, called a Testimony from the Brethren, &c. subscribed by Richard Farnsworth, Alex. Parker, George Whithead, and six more of their principal men.

If any pretend to be of us, and in case of controversy will not admit to be tried by the Church of Christ Jesus (i. e. of the Quakers) nor submit to the judgment given by the Spirit to the Elders and Members of the same; but kick against the judgment as only the judgment of man, it being and is manifest according to truth, and consistent with the doctrine of such good Ancient Friends as have been, and are found in the faith, agreeable to the witness of God in his people: then we resist in the Name of the Lord, if that judgment be so risen against, and be denied by the party condemned; then he or she and such as so far partake of their sins, as to countenance and encourage them therein, ought to be rejected: and having erred from the truth, persisting therein presumptuously, are joined in one with Heathens and Infidels. O the Charity of the Quakers Leaders! All that will not submit to their little Fanctō, are with them numbred with Heathens and Infidels. How much more Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists?



Here the poor Quakers may see the image of themselves among themselves, a party judging and excommunicating those who differ from them (yea in any thing Religious) and that not by the Scriptures, but their own fancy, dominating policy, which they call the Spirit of God in them. So that no regard is to be had to the light in the consciences of those, who think not as the Pack do, who call themselves the Body, the Church. I now marvel therefore, that *W. P.* of all things I charge the Quakers with, least concerned with that part wherein I affirm they symbolize with *Rome*, in her more peculiar principles and practices upon which Popery, as such is founded and maintained: I know not but he may aim at a preferment there, which notwithstanding the leanness of his learning, judgment, and piety may top the highest of them all in confidence, falsehood, imperiousness and anti-christianity.

CHAP. X.

TO my Charge of their denying Gospel-Ordinances in general, he objects against some of my proofs: and first that out of *Fox Myst.* p. 52. *He hath triumphed over the Ordinances, and blotted them out, and they are not to be touched; and the Saints have Christ in them, who is the end of outward forms.* This saith *W. P.* p. 103. *is Scriptural language.* But why so? because some Scripture-words are in it! although the Text be mangled, corrupted, and abused to the contradiction of Scripture-truth. Thus those expressions of the vileness of some persons and things in the Scriptures applied justly and holily by God, they apply sinfully enough; as *False Prophets, Dogs, Serpents, Hypocrites, Devil, Lyar, &c.* But if I should call *W. P.* *Thou Child of the Devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, &c.* and then tell him the *Language is Scriptural*; he would not therefore allow it to be all very true: though so ap-

Plied, it lookt much more like truth than G. Fox's Scriptural Language.

§ 2. G. Fox hath these words about Baptism, and the Lords Supper; which as I shewed at large, were far from being the sense of that Scripture he seems to intend. I also told Mr. Pen, that if the Saints, having Christ in them were the consideration on which the Ordinances (indifferently, as Fox expresses it) are not to be touched; then not only we, but even all others Saints, under the Mosacal Administration, sinned in their practice of Gods Ordinances also: for they had Christ in them, in those days, in the same sense as the Saints in these. Yet though P. give me bad words to strengthen his argument, he doth (as he seldom faileth) grant what I say to be true in his anger: For Christ is to the Saints now who rightly believe in him, the end of all meats, drinks, washings, days. Here Lords Supper, Baptism, and the Christian Sabbath or day of Holy Rest, are all denied in four words. But to make a full end, he adds, or any other temporal, Elementary, or figurative worship. Now if Mr. P. can shew us any Gospel-worship, considered entirely and formally, that is not temporal worship, he will do more than ever man yet did: But in the mean time W. P. hath confirmed my Charge.

§ 3. His next fault he finds, is with my saying that Penington meant by the City of Abomination, visible worship. If the worship which he acknowledgeth God to be found in, and which Professors about the years 43, 44, 45, 46 used, were visible worship, or any part of it visible worship, then Penington said it of visible worship. That this Charge is true against the Quakers, let us hear the Apostle G. Fox confute W. Pen, and confirm for me: Says W. P. p. 104. There will be, there must be, there ought to be a visible worship; therefore most false is John Faldo's Paraphrase. Foolish enough to call it my Paraphrase.

## Quakerism no Christianity.

51

phrase, and more foolish to call it a false one on this ground. Now for all *W. P's.* will, must, ought to be *G. Fox* is or was of another mind: *Paul* brought the Saints off from the things that are seen; and *Water* is seen, and its Baptism; *Myft.* p. 65. Now unless *W. P.* will say, that things seen are not visible, *G. Fox* hath certainly foiled *W. P.*

§. 4. Before he parts from this argument, he grows kind, and shews the power of condiscention to have place in him. *Yet thus far we could go, that visible worship (as such) without a due regard to what kind of worship it may be, and what is the root from whence it came, cannot be well-pleasing to God.* A great compliance indeed! which is thus much just, and no more; a mans filling a Dung-cart, or *W. P's.* acting on the Stage, or the Table, in their meeting place, as like a Fencer as ever was seen; are not worship *because seen*, though they should by some be so called; for every thing that is seen, is not therefore worship.

---

## CHAP. XI.

IN this Chapter he pretends to answer my Charge of their denyng a Gospel-Ministry, which I undertook to prove by divers mediums: *W. P.* shall report the first, p. 105. *They deny all Ministry that hath a mediate Call to that Office, quoting (saith Pen) J. Parnel's Shield, &c.* p. 16. *and their Call to the Ministry we deny, which is mediate.* Having this Charge confessed, there needs no further debate.

§. 2. To my proof of a Call by men he saith nothing. But that he may not seem to have nothing to say, he tells us; *Its not go ye forth into all the world, and preach the Gospel that belongs unto all men, no more than because*

Princes send Ambassadors to Princes with their Credentials; therefore every man ought to do the like in imitation without considering necessary Qualifications. Did you ever meet with so ignorant and impertinent an Answer except the chief Quakers, as E. Burrough, G. Fox? Did ever any of us take those words for our only Call? or pretend we had a Call thereby to preach to all Nations? Did we ever say it belonged to all men to ordain Ministers and without considering qualifications? But his comparison exceeds, because Princes send Ambassadors to Princes, &c. i.e. because Gods send Ministers to Gods therefore every man ought to do the like: A rare similitude-maker! not like to be guilty of Idolatry, by making of likenesses.

He tells us, p. 101. how that Text may be a Commission: *If any holy man, reading the Apostles Commission shall at that instant of time receive an heavenly power make it his, laying that same injunction upon him, and enduing him with such a measure of that Divine Power they received, we shall cheerfully grant him to be true Call'd.* I leave the Comment to the Reader.

¶ P. 107. 8, 9. The old man in W. P. breaks Bonds at once, of Nature, Modesty, Divine and Human Laws: But there is a word or two, which having lain upon his stomach, he vomits up thus: 'As for having no certain dwelling place, and leaving Houses, Lands and Possessions, let them repair to W. Pen, and others their Ministers, for an answer to it, who have lands, possessions, and brave habitations, such as few Ministers, whom they disclaim (especially the poor Nonconformists) enjoy. What cause of such a loathsome expression, or such revenge which follows, in all this? If the Quakers will own those only for their Ministers (in their writing) who have no certain dwelling place and forsake their lands and possessions, and preach the

*Spel in forreign Countries*, Parnel Shield, &c. p. 16. and *W. P.* and others of them, profess themselves to be Ministers of the Quakers stamp; and yet neither leave lands nor possessions, nor certain dwelling places, and herein practically contradict their own Doctrine, and I bid them repair to such to answer for their professed principles: What is here uncivil, or impertinent?

5. In his Answer, his passion so blinded him, that he tells me I hereby pretended to refute *G. Fox*, and therefore was impertinent, and that the words were Scripture words. Whereas I quoted *J. Parnel* for those words, not *G. Fox*. But for *W. P.* to call them Scripture words, which are neither in that order, nor so much as relating to such a subject; much less to the same end in any place of the Scripture, is such an impertinent whim, as becomes one, who is resolved to say something, no matter what.

6. Instead of defending himself and other of their Ministry, in this point contradicting their professed Principles; he charges me with envying their outward plenty. *What doth he envy men the blessings of Heaven?—is his eye evil, because Gods eye is good? Doth his mouth water after the Quakers possessions, now the Government hath justly prevented him of a fat benefice?* All this and much more which follows might have been spared: for envy was as far from my heart, as *W. P.* is from the truth. And had he as much of the World as I could wish him, it should be ten times more than he hath, if he can use it aright, --and he knows how the Non-Conformists (if they made fat Benefices their *summum bonum*) might be so blessed if they pleased.

He hath no sooner gotten to the end of praising himself for his good conscience, and his Father for bestowing such an estate on him; but pag. 109, he wreaks his rage, *Haman* like, on all the Non-Conformists for my dis-

displeasing him. *But why poor Non-Conformists, after all their preach up Battels, Spoils, Plunders, Sacriledges, Decimations, &c. as Rich and Covetous as ever, &c.*

§ 7. What less than that innocency he often brags of, doth he hereby discover ; If false accusations, revenge, spitting defiance against the gracious and wholesome Laws of his Majesty, uncovering his Fathers nakedness be innocent and sinless ; *W. P.* may be no malefactor. Many of the Nonconformists have been as unconcern'd in their Sermons about battels as the most peaceable men that breath, much more in preaching up Spoils, Plunders, Decimations. And wherein any of them are chargeable with any of these, the Act of Oblivion should have bridled *W. P.* from reviving their remembrance. But this man, who calls others persecutors for writing against their errors in Religion, tells us hereby plainly enough ; that if he be but displeased he will call for fire from heaven and earth too, to devour the whole flock and kindred of one that offends him.

§ 8. But how they become chargeable with preaching up Sacriledges by the Quakers principles, is a mystery of iniquity ; who so much exclaim against all such supports of the Clergy, and the Church also, to which the things are related, whose alienation is call'd Sacriledge. Will *W. Pen* turn Cavalier and Prelate too, to satisfy his lust of anger ? We see what a change the Quakers light can make, when it acts the part of fire.

§ 9. But he cares not (so he may but be revenged) to play the part of the accursed *Ham*, in discovering his Fathers nakedness. Were it not that I had respect to the Acts of Oblivion I could easily and truly recriminate on *W. P.* what he falsely charges on the Nonconformists.

With what modesty can this man throw this dirt in the

the faces of the Nonconformists! whose poverty (for the far greater part of them) is so apparent; while he himself wallows in that wealth, whose foundation was laid, in that he paints out with such odious titles. If P. will upon this admonition disgorge what he here charges as the fruits of sin, we may have some better opinion of his Conscience, than all his other ostentations will obtain. In the mean time, we shall conclude his blind fury, not his enlightened Conscience to be the Father of these unworthy Reflections.

§ 10. It follows in the same page, *I am persuaded their Preachings, Christnings, Burials, Churchings, alias lying in Visits, Exhortations, Thanksgivings, and Prayers; have cheated the people of more Gold and Silver, than ever they did dare to make the least pretence to, in their former dayes of power.* — I could give him a long list of more ex-acting, jocky, hackney mercenary bargains, of Presbyterian, Independants, and Anabaptists; than can readily be paralleled by Parish Priests. Let him prove all this when he can. The untruths are so notorious, that the dung will be spread upon his own face, to the infamy of that Spirit he is of.

§ 11. My second proof of their denying a Gospel-Ministry, viz. *The Quakers deny our Ministry, because we preach from the Scripture; He confutes with a worse than mentiris Bellarmine, pag. 110. a wicked lie minted out of bell it self.* And saith farther, *We have laid down no such Proposition, nor tending to it.* He produces on of my testimonies out of J. Parnel, yet but by halves. *And here is the difference of the Ministers of the World, and the Ministers of Christ — The one of the letter, the other of the Spirit.* To which he replies, *strange impudence to call this a proof.* But I cannot help it, if P. will say the Sun is darkness, and call it strange impudence in any to affirm light afforded by it.

§ 12. Before

§ 12. Before I part with him here, I will furnish my Reader, with that part of the same testimony he treacherously leaves out. *For they are meer deceivers and witches, bewitch people from the Truth, holding forth the shadow for the substance, and what is the Chaff to the Wheat.* Add this to the other (as it was in my book) and I dare trust my Reader that is willing to speak truth, to pass his censure. I gave many more proofs of the truth of my Charge, which here (as in all the Chapters he deals with) he hides from his Reader, instead of taking them off by sound argument. Take one of them out of many without Pens leave. It follows in the same Author before quoted, *And so the devil takes Scripture to maintain his Kingdome, and this he delivers by the mouth of his Ministers; which he sends abroad to deceive the nations, leading people in blindness.*

§ 13. Now Reader, judge if the voice of W. Pen be like that truth and meekness he pretends to, who numbers the words *Folly, Vanity, Errour, Ignorance, Delusion* (though by me aptly applyed) among railing speeches, and ill government of my self; and hath the confidence to say moreover, *And glad we are, he found no such subjects from us to treat upon in his p. 252.* I had some what else to doe than to rake all his dung up to make a Nose-gay of.

I have two more of their grounds, for denying a Gospel Ministry. viz. Their denying any to be Ministers who are not infallible, and who study for their sermons. But the gentleman takes it for granted, he hath overthrown my whole fabrick, if he doe but spit at some parts of it.



CHAP. XII.

**A**Mong his contents of this Chap. one is, *His definition for us by its gross contrariety to the Scriptures*: I suppose he intended to speak a better word for himself. Let this pass among his many mistakes, through meer carelessness: far worse follow. P. 112. *From our speaking of the universal Church of God which is in God, he infers that we deny all visible Religious Societies Commonly called by the ancients, the Churches of Asia, Thessalonica &c.* nor one word of this in all my book. My Charge was: that they deny a Gospel-Church, not visible Religious Societies, which may be as far from a Gospel-Church, as halfe a dozen Christian friends associated to eat a good dinner, or to carry on a trade for their outward tranquillity: yet he dares dirt me with *priest wanting understanding, honesty, to grace his forgery.*

§ 2. He proceeds p. 113. in the same evil. *And from our asserting the Spirit to be the only Gospel-teacher of all who believe, he concludes that we deny all preaching, of men though by the Spirit.* The four last words *Though by the Spirit* are added by him and meerly forged on which he exclaims *O blind or disingenuous man!* But if W. Pen hath the face to add exclamations to his falsehood in point of fact: to make people believe he hath plaid the Champion: when he acts only the part of a treacherous and wilful deluder, the fault is his own: and too great an one for an honest man to be guilty of.

That they deny all preachings of men, needs no further proof than their own words *in terminis*, without drawing consequences. Among others of my quotation take this one. G. Fox. brings in the priest (as he calls him) saying, *we utterly deny all their ways and doctrines who exclude all teaching*

ing of man. To which he answers, *Contrary to the prophets who bid people cease from man.* An excellent and infallible expolitor to boot.

§ 3. But he hath an argument will do his work or none will. *What! Charge that upon us which our practice gives the lye to every day!* I am not speaking of their practice, but their tenets, yet there are none in the world (to use his own phrase) whose practices give the lye to their doctrine more than the Quakers in this point, and that of the infallibility of their ministry especially. To my saying as he reports it p. 112. *They contradict themselves for they have more teachers than all others.* He replies *A lye to be sure.* Thus am I confuted for want of better arguments. But if no other pretended Churches have all their members to be preachers, if they have but a motion to it, men, women, and children: what he calls *A lye to be sure*, is surely a truth.

§ 4. For all this bustle, in the very same page he undoes all again, and allows what I charge them with to be very true, and more also. *It cannot be strictly said, that man preaches, but rather the Spirit by man, and man only a mean or instrument thro' which the teaching is convey'd.* So that after his own strict account, he allows their practices viz. *Of preachings of men* to give the lye every day to their tenets; which before he cries out on me for but so much as implying.

§ 5. Read on, and the farther the worse. He affirms the true Church to have other teachers than the Spirit, which is to say, that the primitive Churches were not guided, led, and taught by the Spirit of God only, but by some other teachers also: contrary to express Scriptures, the promise of God, and very end of the blessed Gospel. P. 114. Can you think this man worth disputing with? who rambles and talks he cares not how, but still after his present humour. Tells you that is contrary to express Scriptures, which every Child that

that can but read may find the Scriptures express in a thousand times over. If the man Christ, the Apostles, Prophets, and others are some other teachers than the Spirit; yea the exhortations to do the work of an Evangelist, feed the flock over which the holy Ghost made them overseers, were not intended of mans teaching, but the Spirit of God exhorted the Spirit of God only to these actions, and man had not, hath not, any agency at all in teaching. And for my not being of his wild mood, he concludes me their *Hetical adversary*;

¶ 6. In stead of defeating my arguments to prove their denial of a Gospel-Church, he tells us what Church they own. And that you may expect a most convincing account, he puts his usual confidence in the front. But to clear the point if it can yet be doubtful. *We doe believe that there is one, and but one universal Church the ground and pillar of truth, and that is in God.* Who are the members of this Church he tells you also. *Who are washed in the blood of the Lamb, and ingrafted into the true vine, bringing forth fruit unto holiness.* If he own no other Church but this which is the character of the invisible Church, he owns not a Gospel-Church whose order and frame is according to the doctrine of the Apostles, and practice of the Saints in the new Testament. For the universal Church as including all real Saints, is as well applicable to all the Saints under the old Testament as the new. Yea it is no other than that Church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven; which shall never meet all together and in one visible body, till the world end: and of which the Quakers cannot be, till they fall under another conversion.

¶ 7. To this their invisible Church I told him of their officers very suitable to a conceited nothing. *The holy Ghost made the officers of the Church overseers —* he overseers to be invisible, for they saw with an invisible

eye, and so they was in the Spirit which is invisible, and not in the flesh, Fox Mist. p. 2. But W. Pen meddled no with this, which I dare say (as much as he hath of the Quakers Spirit) he cannot tell the meaning of himself.

§ 8. But there is nothing so foolish, antiscriptural, and ridiculous among the Quakers, which he will not patronize: even to the dutch woman Quakers declaring in dutch to an english Quakers meeting; in which there was not one understood a word she said; and their affirming for all that, that they knew the spake by the Spirit for they all found refreshings. He calls it a *disingenuous reflection* to say this was orderly according to the popish mass, and prayer in a tongue unknown to the people. But why so? because the Quakers *doe not assert such obscurity*. 'tis much he will acknowledge obscurity to be sometime in their declaring. And farther; *The Divine Light, Power or Spirit inwardly manifested is the one tongue to the Children of Light*.

Whatever be the sense or non-sense of this phrase, sure I am that the Spirit of God by whom the Apostle was directed is not the Quakers Spirit. Nor its doctrine the same with theirs in the same case. *I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me*, 1 Cor 14. 11.

§ 9. To my reflection upon their affirming *she spake by the Spirit because they all found refreshings*; viz. So have Children many a time at puppet-plays; he calls me all to nought, especially, because *I could not (as he saith) but think it meant by refreshings, what came from God*. But let not Pen think we take our selves bound to reverence such fooleries, or believe that God will ever so countenance such an abuse of his ordinance. We may be bound as much to reverence all the heathen and popish superstitions, flowing from a foolish darkned heart, as

pretences

pretences to divine refreshings may command it for they pretend it, and are as able to prove it as the Quakers.

§ 1. Yea after all his revilings for my no more reverencing this non-such absurdity, viz. *Implacable Spirit against God, dishonestly profaneness, impudence, more abusive of religion than Ben. Johnsons Alchymist, &c.* he takes his revenge by takeing the liberty to call the doctrine I preach (which is the doctrine contained in the Scriptures and which all Protestants subscribe to to a small difference) *puppet-play doctrine*; and p. 253. to make me and my book odious to those Quakers who would have run away from the dutch womans babble themselves; reports this passage thus. *Refreshments at Quakers meetings, so there is at puppet-plays*; whereas I spake it only of the dutch womans speaking in a language not one of the hearers understood. Of all men *Pen* is the most unfit to charge others with disingenuity lying, ungodliness, impudence &c.

### CHAP. XIII.

Concerning denying the ordinance of hearing the word preached, to my proof from *G. Fox. We must not bear man &c* he saith. *That is so far from making against us, that it makes for us at an high rate.* Much like the mad man of *Athens* who called all the ships that came into the Port his own, while he was for all that but a poor thread-bare gentleman. I proved that they asserted the light to be only preached, to be the onely preacher, and only preached to, or auditor, yea, and the only obeyer. So that the light is all, and man concerned nothing at all in the business of the Gospel. To which he replies just nothing, but after a wilful perverting the end of my producing *Rom. 10. 15. 18. How shall they preach except*  

E

they

\*they be sent &c. From the relatives *they, them, theirs*, being plurals I inferr'd that the Gospel had more preachers than one, and therefore the *nigh or the word light* &c. was not the only preacher; he takes no notice of my argument, but falls a commenting on the word *sent* that he might (though losing the question) save his syntax in bringing in this following passage.

§ 2. *Now, they are right Gospel Ministers, and their feet truly beautiful, whose Gospel is peace on earth and good will towards men; not garments roll'd in the blood of Kings, Princes, Rulers, and people; no worldly armies, Battles, victories, blood trophies, spoils, sequestration, decimations, and the like thirty and tyrannical projects: in which I. Faldo and his poor nonconforming Ministers, have had their hands almost over heads and ears, till they had well-nigh lost their ears and their heads too*

Who would take this to be the voice of the innocent harmless people? what expressions could fall from a pen more mischievous and contrary to the peace and good will, from which at one step he could get into these wrathful expressions? If he would be believed (as may supposed) he then hath hereby attempted to bring all the nonconforming Ministers in danger of being knockt o'th head; and me especially whom he names in particular and at length. Now, I see what they are like to meet with from the Quakers, who dare take pains to discover their rotten principles and displease them: 'tis no more misery and mischief then lyes in their power to procure them

§ 3. But as to my self For whose sake the nonconformists are by the malignity of this answerer thus abused. If he had inquired into my age, he might have found it about thirteen when the last tragedy was acted on the person of any King or prince in this nation, which may sufficiently render the guilt he charges on me to be a blind and

and outrageous slander. And for the Gospel I have preached all can witness who have heard me, that in preaching I have been so unconcerned in blood, spoils and such projects he talks of; as that among the many changes in a short time this nation hath been under, I took no notice therein, who was up or down; and my doctrine might have passed, without offence as well at the Kings Court, as where I preached it.

¶ 4. I know not what to make of his *blood of Kings and Princes* in the plural number, unless, he knows the Nonconformists to have had a hand in some secret making away the great Turk, the Pope, or Cham of tartaria; which was never till now discovered. But if Mr. Pen like Solomons mad man, will be casting firebrands, arrows, and death Prov. 26. 19. let him know 'tis an iniquity to be punished by the judge: and if he do not in print recant this mischievous slander, he may find such a bridle to his so unruly pen, as will not bear the name of persecution for conscience, or declaring the Gospel of peace and good will towards men No, not among very many of the Quakers themselves. who I doubt not will take their cause to be not a little abused, by such a manager.

¶ 5. After blood comes a flood of dirt in his next words *Such covenant-breaking, Self-seeking, Proud, Covetous, tyrannical, club-law, persecuting priests, we could never own. — the locusts, Caterpillars, serpents, and dragons of the earth; whose cruelty self-seeking, and falseness hath deceived God and men &c.* Can you suppose these passages to come from the meekness and gentleness which the Quakers so much brag of? And it is no little reflection on the body of the Quakers, and the spirit by which they are led, that this book of Pen's is imputable, and every passage of it to them, especially considering the test their printed peices pass through, of which take this ac-

count. And we further desire from time to time, faithful and sound friends and brethren may have the view of such things, as are printed upon truths account, as formerly it hath used to be, before they go to the press, that nothing but what is sound and savory, and that will answer the witness of God in all people (even in our Adversaries) may be exposed to publick view. Testim. from the Brethren, subscribed by nine of their Ministry. Either Pens book hath passed this Test or not; if it hath, then the witness in the tryers have approved it, and they and their witness, which they call the Light, Spirit, Christ; are guilty of all the Forgeries, Falshoods, Slanders, and Mischief therein expressed. If not *W. Pen*, who pleads so hard in his Spirit of *Alexander*, &c. For compliance with the body, and charges their Nonconformists with rebellion against the Light, Apostacy, and many more hard names; is guilty of such crimes himself.

#### CHAP. XIV.

**H**E according to my charge disowns mans will and the use of his conceptions, or understanding to have any thing to do in Gospel-prayer, p. 122. and disowns a prayer that is not *by and in the light within*: the Quakers Christ. The reasons he gives are as witless as his assertions truthless. *Now unless men may perform Gospel worship without the Spirit, and the Truth; or if in the Spirit and the Truth; yet not by the motion of either, a thing absurd, must needs be, that men ought only to pray or preach by the motion of the Spirit and of the Truth.* How absurd his reasoning here! As if the understanding, conception will of man in Prayer must needs exclude the motion of the Spirit, or the motions of the Spirit exclude them, and both the one and the other could no way con-



in the performance of Spiritual duties. Were it good reasoning to say, if *W. Pen* cannot write without his hand, it must needs be that he must write onely with his hand; without the use of his pen, ink, or brains either. The Apostle (as I quoted him) saith, *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with understanding also*. Just cross to him, who pretends to argue Scripturally. Beside if nothing of man be to be exercised in prayer; not the faculties of his Soul; then the Spirit of God onely must pray to God, and so God prays to himself. If Mr. *P.* believe this to be good reasoning he is scarce *compos mentis*, a dangerous case especially for a man of his estate. If he believeth not what he saith himself, he is worse. I also charged them with praying, not in the name of Christ; and going to God immediately in that duty without a Mediatour, and that the *one Mediatour between God and man, the man Christ Jesus* was not owned by them to have now at all a being, to which with many other on this head, he is totally silent.

---

C H A P. XV.

**T**O my Prologue to positive Ordinances he begins his answer with a Forgery, p. 119. He tells us the Ordinances hitherto considered are called moral, from their natural obligation; although respecting the substance they deserve a more evangelical denomination, without which we cannot call them Christian Ordinances. By his forging and corrupting my words he taketh advantage to infer many things absurd. Whereas if he had been so honest as to report them aright; he should have shewed himself absurd enough to draw from them such conclusions. He that hath the conscience to deal thus with

## 66 Quakerism no Christianity

his Adversary, may make him say what he list himself.

My words were these to a letter. *The Ordinances I have hitherto considered are called moral, from their natural obligation; although that substantial and essential part and qualification of them, their respect to a Mediator; will require a denomination more evangelical and without which we cannot call them Gospel or Christian Ordinances.* Let him make the best advantage for his cause these words will afford him and spare not. But to cut off that part of them, which I say doth denominate them Christian, and then tell me of my self-contradiction against my first Chapter, is fault enough alone to stain any man that is not all black already.

¶ 2. He is at the same work again, p. 130. But confidently affirms God to be more concerned in the vindication, and take vengeance for the breach of his Positive and exterior Precepts, as the ceremonial part of the Jews worship, and the bread, wine, water, &c. What I said I proved, and all my confidence lay but in the strength of my proof; which Pen, should after my words exactly reported, have refuted, if he could: but he knows he is better able to flie-blow my assertions, than answer my Arguments.

¶ 3. A passage p. 132. I cannot perswade my self to let passe, though if I should take notice of all of the like complexion my book would swell with Mr. Pens corruption. *It is no less than blaspheming in our Adversary, and an evident contradiction to himself, to assert that the light he grants those immutable Ordinances to result from, may be doubtful or decay respecting it self, since it were to say, that God — is doubtful, and lyable to decay.*

The light I spake of was natural light, or the light of nature, in exprefs terms which we dare not, nor the Quakers do not say is God; but a humane faculty. The Ordinances  
that

that result from this light are none of my words, who would be ashamed to talk so confusedly, as if the light by which I understand an Ordinance were it from whence it resulted, and not rather the will of God expressed. By this you may understand what he means by blasphemy.

If 4. Water Baptism he disowns to be a Gospel-Ordinance. His reasons I shall answer briefly. *Christ never was Administrator of water Baptism, p. 133.* It is Christs command, and not his being immediate Administrator that constitutes an Ordinance. Again *p. 136. That Baptism mentioned, Mat. 28. was not the baptism of John, but the baptism of the Holy Ghost called the promise of the Father.* — He distinguishes not betwixt Johns water baptism and his own; but betwixt any water baptism at all, and his own baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Baptism with the Holy Ghost was not baptism in a proper but analogical or metaphorical sense. For the inconsistency he talks of in water Baptism with that proposition 'Etc, it is a mistake: for baptism with water was into the name, &c. as a Sign, and baptism with the Holy Ghost according to the right meaning of the words, which is the gifts of the Holy Ghost, might also be where the persons so gifted were not really ingrafted into Christ or sanctified. Christ calls his crucifixion his baptism. John saith not only that he that came after him should baptize them with the Holy Ghost; but also with Fire. many things are expressed by the word Baptism, yet but one proper baptism which is with water.

If 5. He tells me *p. 137.* of the Apostle Paul's practice. Practice then we see (and all the reasonable world knows) is not institution. This is not a very sound expression in it self. I do not say that practice is institution, but the practice of the Apostles in pursuance of an institution, is a proof of its continuance. *p. 140.* He

## 68 Quakerism no Christianity

confutes me with hard words. *I shall grant to him that the thing signifying and signified are sometimes called by one and the same name, as baptisme: but when distinguished by water and the Holy Ghost, I hope nothing that is not so blind and hardened as John Faldo (if yet he himself) will say, that therefore they are but one baptisme.* He did well to put in the parenthesis, for indeed I am not so blind as to say that they are but one because distinguished, nor yet to say as *W. P.* from no very quick sight, that baptisme was a sign of those miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, which the words intend.

¶ 6. But the Gentleman hath a sight that discovers that which never man did before, or else he imposes a great falsehood with no little confidence. *And frequently his Apostles, yet the Baptist himself seemed to take all occasions whereby to let people know, that his baptisme was BUT that of water, and that the baptisme of Christ was NOT OF WATER.* Although on the contrary it is apparently true; that they took all occasions for the practice of water baptisme. With one instance among the rest, I shall answer the whole of his objections, and especially his last p. 141. of baptisme the sign being done away because the thing signified is come.

If he intend by the thing signified saving grace, then it was come to many before baptisme was at all instituted, and faith in *Jesus Christ* was required in all the adult before baptism was offered. If of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Apostle *Peter* was so far from arguing after his fashion, that he makes it the ground of baptizing them. *Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* But if *W. Pen* had been there with the same Spirit he is now led by, he would have accepted the challenge: and reproved *Peter* of ignorance and sin, for commanding them to be therefore baptized, which was the reason why they should not be baptized.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

**H**AVING little to any purpose to say upon the point of the Lords Supper, he hath recourse to his old shifts. First, he charges the Independents with the death of *J. Parnel*, p. 141. but what is that to the Question? and I believe as little to the truth, as my hand in the blood of Kings and Princes. But further he stands to *J. Parnel's* words, *The bread and Wine being of an outward, elementary nature and substance, may with respect to what they signify be very properly termed natural and carnal, for so they are.* Very well becoming *Pen's* crowing Divinity and Philosophy. Fire and Air are of an elementary nature, is Fire and Air therefore carnal? the thing signified is the Body and Blood of *Christ* broken and shed, was not that as well outward and carnal too? he knows whose expression of them was *your carnal Christ is denied by the light.*

But I perceive in his Divinity and Philosophy also, he follows *G. Fox* the Quakers great Apostle, who saith of the Bells *Mr. Baxter* commended to be no carnal things because they sounded so clear and were heard so far off; *If they be not carnal then they are spiritual, Fox* great Mystery, &c.

2. But though *Mr. P.* be not very deedly, he never is at a loss for words, bravado's, and out-cries; of which he he gives a rare proof here. *To the second [ citation ] I do challenge J. Faldo to make it good, and require it at his hand in the view of the world, to produce any such words out of W. Smith's Books: and that he may not plead mistake of Authors, I will give him the scope of all our Books and Friends to prove, that we ever called the bread and wine Christ blest, the invention of the Pope.*

Reader, This is the third citation he seems to charge with

with forgery; but if he can prove me guilty of that crime in but one, I will be content to bear the hardest censure: It is a thing I abhor, and which reputation as well as conscience puts a strong bar against, with those that have a sense of either.

3. In my defence I shall first report the citation on which he grounds his challenge; which if he had done, he must have omitted this brave, or declared himself altogether careless and shameless. *They [ Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper ] are the Popes invention — the Priest gives it to the People, and tells them it is the blood of Christ, and is shed for them, when it is wine and not blood,* Smith Prim. p. 39. What he insinuates & charge them with, viz, *Calling the Bread and Wine Christ blest the invention of the Pope;* I am as little concerned to make proof of as he is honest in makeing report of: my book laying no such thing to their charge.

But you are to take notice ( for escaping his evasion ) that his words import that very same Bread and Wine which Christ and his Disciples eat and drank together at Jerusalem; Whereas my charge is of the Bread and Wine used in the Ordinance of the Lords Supper after his death, among Gods people and his Churches. And although the Quakers do not call it the Lords Supper, yet it being truly that Ordinance, I ought to apply their words to the Name which they apply to the thing. And for the proof of their so reproaching the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, as coming from the Pope; if *Pen* dare deny it to be in *Smith's Book* ( which I quoted ) three or four times over in p. 39. I shall prove him a deceiver to all that will but read it. He answers to this question. *I would know Father, how it is concerning those things called Ordinances, as Baptisme, and Bread and Wine, which are much used in their worship?* Answ. *Why Child, as for those things they rose from the Popes invention, &c.*

§ 4. Upon

§ 4. Upon this charge of his which hath both falshood, and wilful forgery in it ; he exclaims on me in these words : *O ungodly man ! What hast thou done ? that God should give thee up, not onely to believe lies thy self, but to endeavor to make others do the like. Thy book shall be a millstone about thy neck in the day of the righteous and terrible judgement of God.* Such words as these they use to affright people with, who consider not the justice or injustice of the cause. Such *bruta fulmina* I frequently meet with in his book, which as they are without reason from him, they are without regard from me : Except to observe how a deluded hard heart, and a scared Conscience can make bold with God and his judgements ; as if they were to be thrown at all that offend them right or wrong. His further wild reasonings against the Ordinance of the Lords Supper, *That sign is no longer of force in point of institution than till the thing signified is come*, p. 143. *that Christ is come*, p. 144. *that the Epistles of Paul to Timothy make no mention of it*, and others of like weight, I pass by as enough bespeaking the emptiness of their author : onely consider that the Lords Supper is a remembrance of Christs death past, not to come.

CHAP. XVII.

UPON the point of Justification, I cited 13 proofs of my charge : to three of which he answers by the way of evasion and railing, being silent to the rest.

The first is of E. Burrough, *All that are called Presbyterians and Independents, with their feeding upon areport of a thing done many hundred years ago.* The next of Farnsworth, *What righteousness Christ performed without me was not my justification, neither was I saved by it.* To the first he tells me I construe it wickedly, John Faldo shews him-  
self

self wholly unacquainted with honesty and truth. But why so? He meant no more than their excessive admiration of and regard to what Christ did without, &c. Thus he thinks to salve all with his meanings; which are well nigh as corrupt as the Quakers text: For the admirations of what Christ then did will admit of no excess, no not among the glorified Saints. But in the mean time *Burrough*, and the Quakers that own him, are so far from excessive admiration of Christs transactions without us, that they blasphemously condemn them.

¶ 5. To the second Citation he seeks to amend one error by another much a kin to it. *What gives daily access and acceptance to and with the Lord, is that preparation of clean and righteous adornment, the Soul actually receives from Christ, &c. take Justification in this sense and not for Remission—— and let our Adversary do his worst.* There needs a Diver of *Delos* to make very good sense of these words. I am so well acquainted with the Quakers meanings as well as their sayings, that I dare affirm he intends by it no other righteousness for access and acceptance, than what is subjected (with respect to its habits and acts) in men: and is therefore with all that understand sense, our own righteousness. And that Mr. Pen may not trouble himself to challenge me to prove this sense or meaning to be any allowed Quakers, I shall prevent him with a citation out of *Smiths Catech. p. 74.* *For we have life before we have motion to act or do anything that is pleasing to God, and in that life we have salvation; and so life and salvation is freely given us of God.* This is his answer to a question, *What is the righteousness that justifieth in the sight of God?* This Citation Mr. Pen had to consider in this Chapter he pretends to answer, but he forbears it among many other which say more for my purpose, than he dare transcribe.

§ 3. The third citation he confutes after his fashion

was



was out of Penington, Can outward bloodcleanse the Conscience? Can outward water wash the Soul clean? He beseeches the Reader to hear my Comment, and I am not in so much danger by it as to wish the Reader to forbear; especially he haveing in his report forgot to corrupt and fly-blow it with his wonted forgeries. "A plain denial of the efficacy of the blood of Christ shed on the Cross, to cleanse the Soul from the guilt of Sin; by its satisfaction to the justice of God. But who except *W. P.* would have thought my Comment worthy of what he applies to it, viz. *I have had to do with many enemies of Gods truth, but I must profess to the world; I never yet saw, spake to, or read of a more disingenuous man: to pervert our words, alter sentences, draw generals from particulars, and then call them ours is base and unworthy.* The Quakers words I have given to a tittle, neither more nor lesse, and that he knows full well. My comment is so clearly the sense of the words, that he that shall read *P's.* comment on mine may conclude, that it being just then in his head, he clapt it to the next of my words he met with; lest he should forget, and lose so happy an invention before he should find somewhat truly deserving it, with the rest of his flowers of rhetorick added in the next page 149 to the same case, and in the same breath: *His ranker; so foolish, so impiously unjust.*

§ 4. But when all comes to all, my fault was; that whereas (as he saith) Penington meant it of cleansing by way of sanctification, I construe it a denying Christs blood to cleanse from the guilt of Sin past. But he that understands Conscience and its acts according to reason, Scripture, and experience, needs not many words to perswade him, that Conscience is very conversant in reflecting the guilt of Sin past and its consequences to the terror of the Soul. This is the onely meaning of a purged or cleansed conscience in Heb. 10. 2. For then would they

not have ceased to be offered, because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of Sins. I suppose he will not say it means, making no conscience of committing sins, but a Conscience not imputing the guilt, i. e. the *reatus ad pœnam*. And if we allow P's construction, that he denied the blood of Christ, which he calls *outward* to have an influence into Sanctification, he commits a fouler error. For cleansing the Conscience by sanctification is the effect of the blood of Christ, as well as the other. The New Testament or Covenant is by Christ said to be *the Cup of the New Testament in my blood*. Wherein all the Promises and Mercies of the New Testament are asserted to be founded in the blood of Christ; of which I think cleansing by Sanctification is none of the least.

If 5. But the vanity of the man breaks out to purpose, p. 148. *Or else is he so impiously unjust, that because we do deny that outward blood can be brought into the Conscience, to perform that inward work; therefore J. Pennington denies any efficacy to be in that outward offering and blood towards justification?* Although the Quakers upbraid us with being grossly carnal, none of us all are so carnal to believe that the blood of Christ which he shed must be taken into our Consciences like a dose of purging Physick into the body, which he here insinuates; but its efficacy and merit applyed to our Souls by a true and lively faith: yet it is outward blood still that ought to be so applyed, and hath where it is so such an efficacy.

Yet that the Quakers deny remission by the blood of Jesus without us, as well as Sanctification, take Smith's word for it, *Cat. p. 64. We believe that Christ in us doth offer up himself a living Sacrifice to God for us, by which the wrath of God is appeased to us.* This passage I cited, which P. among many others takes no notice of. And if this can be the blood of Christ shed at Jerusalem on the

he Cross of wood, 'tis a most incredible mystery.

§. 6. He charges me p. 150. with a *base perversion*, and *misusing the word imputation*, for saying, that it being be by grace, it was the imputation therefore of another, not our own: But to my large proofs out of the fifth of *Rom.* and many more, he answers nothing; and therefore I am not obliged to take notice of his Declaration following, impertinent to an Answerer.

CHAP. XVIII.

Page 157. he gives the Contents of my 18th Chap. 'The Quakers disown and deny the Christ of God, and set up a false Christ in his room and stead, and attribute all to that false Christ, which is due and peculiar to the true Christ.

For the making good the first part of my Charge, I undertook to prove, that they deny the Man Christ Jesus, that was born of the Virgin Mary, to be the Saviour of Believers, &c.

According to his wont, he takes notice of only two of my proofs among many more, and in his Reply to them makes a great noise with a meer beating the Air; and then vapours and scolds egregiously, as if he had done his business incomparably well. P. 158. he produceth one of my Citations out of Penington: *This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment Christ; but that which appeared and dwelt in the body.* He adds only one more out of the same Author; *For that which he took upon him was our garment, even the flesh and blood of our nature, (very right, but what follows is wofully false) which is of an earthly perishing nature, but he is of an heavenly nature.* This last Citation he maims, by leaving out, and his *flesh, and blood,*

and bones, are of his nature; i. e. not of our nature.

§. 2. By these Citations, among others, I proved the Quakers to deny the Humane Nature of Christ, which being an Essential Constitutive part of the true Christ, whoever holds forth a Christ without it, and denies the true Christ to be so constituted, denies the Christ of God.

But let us see how he defeats my improvement of these Citations. First (saith he) he acknowledgeth we own that there was such a man as Jesus the Son of Mary, and that God was in him. What then? saith P. which makes up our Christ. But this I told him was no more than the Quakers profess of themselves, viz. that they are men, and God is in them; which he reports, p. 158. and yet denies it not by one word. Secondly, That he whom we call Christ is not John Faldo's Christ, for he was that body ONLY that died. Here the word only he forgets, which only serves his end. P. 159. he makes my allowing Christs Body to be his Garment, to imply it is not Christ himself. I answer, so the Apostle Paul called his, and the Saints bodies, their cloathing, 1 Cor. 5. yet they were nevertheless a part of themselves.

§. 3. But W. Pen making it so ridiculous a thing to call the Body of Christ by the name of Christ, and to assert it to be so; I would ask him, if he would not call him a Lyar and a Deluder, who seeing his living body, and knowing it to be the body of W. P. should deny that he saw W. P. for he saw but his body, and that was not W. Pen? And by the same rule, while the Quakers cry out of their being wounded and beaten, 'tis but a Cheat; for 'tis but their bodies so dealt with, and not themselves. Yet after all his heat, the Quakers and he will not own that body which was born of the Virgin Mary, to be now the Body of Christ, so much as the bodies of Thomas and Jane, who are Quakers now living

ving; and in whose flesh they say Christ is now manifest, while the Body of Jesus is turned into lifeless dust. *We witness (saith Fox) the same Christ that ever was, now manifest in the flesh.*

S. 4. His following discourse is in opposition to no body that I know of, that calls the *meer* Body of Christ, and that which is *only* his body, without respect to his Soul, or his Divinity, the *entire* Christ: And to prove that the Body of Christ is not the entire Christ, *i. e.* whole Christ, both his Godhead and Manhood, p. 159, 160, 162. yet p. 163. he acknowledges in Capital Letters, 'That I deny the Flesh and Bloud of Christ, to be 'Christ separated from his Soul, of the nature of mans 'Soul, (but undefiled) or that we take his mans nature 'to be Christ separated from his Eternal and Divine 'Nature; upon which he truly reflects upon himself, *One would think I had spent my time in vain, when I set about to prove, that the Divine Light, Life, Power, Wisdom and Righteousness, were not unconcerned in the true Christ; and consequently that the body, or whole manhood, was not the entire Jesus or Saviour.* And who that understands any thing will account it less than vain, and him other than a vain trifler and worse, to oppose with such a pendants Magisterialness what his Adversary never asserted? and so often to forge the *meer* and *only* body to be by me asserted, to be the *entire* Christ. A greater wickedness than his, who treacherously conveys stolen goods into his Neighbours possession, and then charges him with the Theft. But this is *Pen's* high-way, and beaten road.

S. 5. Whereas I produced abundance of Scriptures to prove that the Man Jesus is the Christ; he will by no means allow them to have that sense, no not that in Luke 2. 26. *And it was reveal'd to him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lords*

F

Christ.

*Christ.* Neither that the Child Jesus, whom *Simeon* took up in his arms, was the Christ: Certainly (saith he *p. 161.* this allegation from *Luke 2. 26.* will never prove the body of Jesus, which the Father prepared for him, to be the whole entire Christ, &c. neither did I produce it to prove the body to be such; but Jesus, the Child Jesus, to be the Christ. What disputing can there be with a man that neither keeps to my words, nor the question? Let us observe how boldly he abuses that Scripture, *Acts 5. 30, 31.* The words are thus to be understood. The God of our Father who raised up (the body of) Jesus from the dead, which ye slew, and hung upon a tree, him (whose body you so cruelly used) hath God exalted with his right hand, &c. Beside this construction which renders it not to be Christ, but only his body that suffered, and so Christ never suffered, nor died, nor rose; he corrupts the words themselves, and in stead of *whom ye slew*, which refers to the person who is the Prince and Saviour, he makes it, *which ye slew*; that it may intend only the body, and not the person of Christ. He that dare to corrupt the Text of the Scripture to serve his errors, will count it a light thing to corrupt and alter my words.

*p. 6.* Further, to back this fancy, he tells us of the absurdity of holding Christ to be *hanged on a Tree, laid in the Sepulchre, &c.* *P. 164.* But because the man *Some* was not mortal, and could not be hanged on a Tree; and put into a Sepulchre, it follows, that it was the visible body which could only be hanged on a Tree, and laid in a Sepulchre, that was and is the only and entire Lord and Saviour in *J. Faldo's* sense. But if it follow upon my sense, it follows on the words and scope of the Scripture, which saith the same in so many words, and in the same sense a hundred times. But there is no such absurdity follows upon it: The Soul cannot die, cannot therefore the man die? if not, there is no such thing as killing of men, or mortals.

mortal men: for Souls cannot be killed, or die, nor *W. Pen's* Father is not dead, and therefore he hath no right to his Possessions.

§. 7. But I know *P.* hath more wit than he shews here, and knows that the body being an essential constitutive part of man, when that is killed or dies, the man dies; the frame is dissolved that is denominated from the union of Soul and Body. But moreover, the impossibility of the Souls being *hanged on a Tree*, is worthy consideration. I had thought that the Soul being united with the body till death, where ever the body was disposed, the Soul was also; and therefore the body so long as it *lives* hanging on a Tree, the Soul hangs there too. Many a poor wretch could tell him at the torment of execution (especially a lingering one) that his Doctrine is false: for were but their souls separated from their bodies, their bodies might be cut and hacked long enough ere they could feel pain, or cry out of their torment.

§. 8. After all this forgery, opposing Reason, abusing Scriptures, to prove the Man Jesus not to be the Christ; he hath the confidence to build his Triumph with these true, meek, mannerly, and civil expressions: *Is this the man that must be thought fit to rant it over us with such impudent scurrility? ungodly as well as UN-MANNERLY reflections?* (It is somewhat rare for a Quaker to blame unmannerliness) *But in the earth there is not any such thing so fantastical, conceited, proud, RAILING, busie body, and sometimes ignorant, as a sort of Priests, an ill-bred and pedantick Greco, the bane of Reason, and pest of the World; the old Incendiaries to Mischief, and the best to be spared of Mankind.*

§. 9. Reader, although the greatest crime of, and charge against the Quakers, be their denying the Christ of God; yet, beside his so unfaithful and successless op-

posing

posing the first Member of my charge in this Chapter, he lets pass, without any notice, my charge of their setting up a false Christ, both with respect to his Humane Nature, yea and his Divine Nature also (which they brag of and insist so much on their right belief of) and their attributing all that to their false Christ, which they allow to be due and peculiar to the true Christ: also their not owning any Mediator betwixt God and man, and rendring God the Father as much Christ as the Son.

And whereas I produced twenty two citations for proof out of their acknowledged Authors, he pretends to take notice of two only, and wholly over-looks the other twenty. But if he can satisfy himself, that he hath answered and taken off my charge by this slight attempt, he might as well (and in some respects better) have rested on calling his Book an Answer in the Title-page, and left all the rest of the pages perfect blanks.

## CHAP. XIX.

**U**PON my Exposition of *John 1. 9. That was the true light, &c.* he makes a huge brag of the advantage I give his Cause; and thus he argues from my words: *If Christ made all things, then Christ was before his appearance, p. 681. And consequently Christ was and is the Word which was with God, and is God, and the light of men, &c.* But further (saith he) he tells us in so many words, that the Salvation and Life Eternal of poor sinners was wrapt up in Christ as God; yea, and as Man too: yet as this excludes not his Divinity as necessary to our Salvation, neither doth his Divinity exclude his Humanity as necessary. Sure he is conscious he hath little to say for himself, that catcheth so greedily at his Adversaries words, to stay himself on, which are so little to his purpose.



## Quakerism no Christianity.

81

§. 2. He tells me p. 171. I am much stumbled at his rendring *οτι ουκ enlighteneth*. I know not any cause he hath to think so, unless for rebuking him for wasting so many pages in quoting authorities, for that which would be granted easily: and especially his ostentation of his reading ( which he that is enriched with the *Polyglot Bible* may turn to the greater part in a few hours ) while he asserts elsewhere, we must forget all our traditional read knowledge. But rather than not fall foul on me ever and anon, he will fasten absurdities and scoffs on the most plain doctrine of the Apostle. Upon these words of mine, none can believe without hearing, nor hear without a preacher: which are as like *Pauls* as any that are not the same, and the sense exactly the sense of that Text, *How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher?* for this he tells me p. 176. I might much better have said of myself than of the *Quakers meeting* ( of which I never said any such thing ) *That I was but a puppet indeed,* and makes its consequence to be a denying what ever comes by or from the inspiration of the Almighty. Yea, a farewell to the truth of the Scripture. A strange latitude for making of consequences, *quodlibet ex quolibet*. Should he not have taken himself to be the mad Disputant, he calls me p. 177. for words and sense my book is not acquainted with.

§ 3. The last part of my exposition, viz. that the *THAT WAS* the true light points at Christs appearance in the flesh; I added in his state of humiliation. This he saith p. 178. *stints Christ to that appearance, denies Christ to be now the true light that enlightens all, and he might as well infer that because the word was with God, and was God, therefore he is not now with God or God. But to blast all in a breath, is this your Tertullus!* I would have Mr Pen more solid and pertinent, or leave his scribbling

## 82 Quakerism no Christianity

bling humour; which if it continue at this rate, he is fit to write to none but those who can find refreshments by a Dutchwomans babbling ( though understanding not one syllable ) upon the conceit it comes all from the spirit. He should have undertaken to prove that Christ was before that time, and is now *God manifest in the flesh* as he was then, and to those ends; and then he had writ like one who ( at least ) understood his task, though there is no danger of its being performed.

§ 5. To my exposition of Rom. 10. 3. *The word is nigh thee*, &c. he tells me I give a more carnal interpretation and dark, than our modern Socinians. But to overrun me, he hath got the knack to lame my words by cutting off some principal member. He ( saith P. ) *makes the word in the heart* Deut. 20. 14. *To be having them without book, or by rote.* If he had added in the love of its contents viz. Of the book of the written law, which were the words immediately before those he quotes; it would have put more spirituality into my exposition, than stands with his design of detracting and abusing me and the truth.

§ 6. But p. 19. he ventures to say, *the word mentioned by Moses could not be the outward commandments and statutes, for the question was not about them, but about the commandment of Commandments, and the word of words.* And that it may not be without proof, he will make Scripture himself to serve his turn. He resolves it thus ( saith P. ) *Let none say who shall ascend — to fetch the great word and commandment.* All this he puts in the letter of the text, as the very words of Moses. A crime to be abhorred? yet, frequent with him, who pretends a sacred esteem of the Scriptures.

§ 7. In few words to answer all. *Moses saith of this word Verse 12. It is not in heaven which may be said*

cf

of the book of the law or written word, but not of Christ the word. I hope Mr. Pen, will not say Christ is not in heaven, though he deny the Son of Mary to be there in his body of flesh: also as I told him before 'tis such a word as uses to be in the mouth, which is the organ and instrument of speaking. *In thy mouth*, a word that is to be done, which a prescript word may be; but to talk of doing Christ is a most absurd phrase, *that thou mayest do it*. In the text of the Apostle in Rom. 18.3. the greek word for *the word* is *ῥῆμα*, which is never to be understood of Christ: not *λόγος*, which is sometimes intended of Christ the word.

§ 8. A third Scripture he opposes my exposition of is 2. Pet 1.19. wherein his Chief business is to quarrel our translation, The greek is *καὶ ἡ χάρις βεβαιότερον ἢ προσέτιμα λόγον*. He tells me that although our translation hath *καὶ also*, yet it is commonly understood by *Δὲ but*, which signifies a comparison pag. 186. If John Faldo *has but greek and honesty enough*, he must needs acknowledge that positives, comparatives, and superlatives are used promiscuously in the greek, this I shall shew to be little to purpose, except his ostentation of his little learning, and contempt of others.

§ 9. If Stephanus, Passor, Schrevelius, Scapula, and Leigh, understand greek, *Kai* signifies *and, also, for, and if, although*, and many more: yea, and very often *but*, and is an adverbative particle. *καὶ ἔτι οὐκ ᾔστε αὐτὸν* John 8. 55, *yet or but ye have not known him*: *καὶ ἡμῶν χρίσμα*, *but ye have an anointing*, 1 John. 2. 20. To be short, the construction of words of various signification is to be made as most suits with the context. But that *βεβαιότερον* should be rendered in the positive degree not comparative he produceth some authorities. The Syriak and Ethiopick versions, which gave him little countenance

## 84 Quakerism no Christianity

tenance by we have over and above a sure word. An ancient word, he tells me the French, German, Low-Dutch, Swedish have it in the positive, but I not having his Polyglot Bible, cannot easily examine them all, if he do not wrong them. He adds *Erasmus* Paraphrase and *Beza's*, both of whom he abuses. *Erasmus* renders it by *firmitorem*, *Beza* by *firmissimum*, the one a more firm, the other a most firm, in the old Latine it is most sure, in the new Latine more sure. So *Dr. Hammond*, *Arias*, *Montan.* and *Piscator* in *scholia*, most firm.

All these I have examined and many more, all of which not one excepted but render it in the comparative or superlative degree. Not that they intend thereby the writings of the Prophets more true in themselves, than any other revelation of the mind of God: But more certain with respect to the Jews, who had a greater esteem for, and testimony of the writings of the Prophets to be of God and not a delusion, than of *Peters* private revelation. Thus far he hath attempted to recover the Scripture, I told him Quakerism had no kindness from, and thus far (by the grace of the Lord) I have defended them from his corruption, and the Quakers service. My exposition of *Colos. i. 25.* *Christ in you, &c.* (though the most opposite to the Quakers Christ within) he hath not one word of answer to.

### CHAP. XX.

**T**O my charge of Idolatry he answers as one that tended to confirm not confute it: his very denials implying a large grant of the question; p. 192, 193. *We do for ever renounce any such principle, as that the Soul of man simply as such is the very essence and being of God.* Then it is with him the very essence or being of God, though not because it is the

the Soul of man. Let them who assert it to be so make it out how it comes to pass, 'tis enough to my purpose that they affirm it, again p. 193. *We never did, do, nor shall assert the God that made heaven or earth to be comprehensible within the Soul of man, — so that when we say the light is within any, we do not intend the whole being of light.* All that he denies here, is but God's being so in the Soul of man, as that he is no where else or nothing else; yet allowing the Soul and light within to be God essential: which is as much as I charged them with, and which I proved to be gross Idolatry; they not being God in any measure (a phrase they use, but no body else.) To my Arguments he saith nothing.

But for all his talk Smith saith *They are false Ministers, who preach Christ without, and bid people believe in him as he is in heaven above: but they are the true Ministers that preach Christ within.* So that if he that is to be believed in, even Christ, as God, they hold him to be within as an Object of Faith, and not in heaven above. If I had quoted no more, but this as my proof he must have owned my charge or condemned Smith's doctrine or shewed himself a refractory Caviler.

§ 2. Of 23 citations out of acknowledged Quakers he nibbles a little at five, p. 192. to Fox juniors, who calls the light *the eternal God which created all things.* In his continued discourse (personating the light) he calls it *the light in you, me the light in them:* which P. would evade by saying, I granted that in the first part *within man* was not mentioned.

§ 3. The next he brings off as cleverly. *Every man has that which is one in union with the Spirit of Christ even as good as the Spirit of Christ, according to its measure, E. Burrough.* Can any man (saith he) be so stupid as to think that E. B. ever intended the soul of man that purely and simply constitutes him such; for he is speaking of that universal

versal grace, light, Spirit, which God hath given unto all, &c.

*His purely and simply constitutes* is pure learned nonsense. If what every man has be as good in kind as the Spirit of Christ, which he confesseth, it must be God and Christ; for there is nothing so good in kind as the Spirit of Christ which is God, but God himself. But by its measure it seems P. will have, 'tis as good but not so great, or so much as the Spirit of God. Enough of this.

That of Fox he deals treacherously in, leaving out the Proposition to which the answer is made, and thereby its sense also. F. brings in the Priest saying, *it is an expression of a dark deluded mind to say that God is not distinguished from his Saints.* To which he replies, *He is a reprobate and out of the Apostles doctrine.* What can be better proved? if God be not distinct from them, not only their Souls, but the composition of the Saints, Souls and bodies are God. Yet P. can take the first part of Fox's reply, viz. *But God and Christ is in the Saints*, on which I grounded not my conclusion; and as if I had done so; tells me I quarrel Scripture. But if this passage do not prove P. a designed Deluder none in the world will.

p. 4. He tells me p. 197. that Fisher did not mean *the Spirit of man that is any part of mans nature*, whereas his very words are, *The Spirit of man which concurs to the constituting man in his Primitive perfection.* I told him also that Fisher allowed no man in his degenerate estate to have any Spirit at all as constitutive of man.

Besides the citations, which he is pleased to take notice of, among many other take these few hints, which in my book were more large. *Thou makes a great pudder that any one should witness he is equal with God; is not the Soul without beginning? it is infinite in itself, a part of God.* Fox great Mytery.

I proved also that according to their principles this Soul, Spirit, Light, which they call God, a part or measure of the essence of God; they give divine worship unto, and some of them I instanced in who gave visible worship (professed by them to be divine worship) to the person of man, with respect to the God in them; all which hath no reply from *Pen* but silence; therefore this charge remains in its full force without the invalidating the least proof, much less of the whole.

Did the World know the blasphemous and unheard of passages and principles, which are among their Ministry (as they call them) conceived, vented, and allowed: it would make their ears tingle, and their hearts ache, One evidence of which coming to my hand by a good and seasonable providence, I thought fit to annex it to this chapter, its matter agreeing therewith.

In a Letter to *George Fox*, the principal man among the Quakers, written from the *Barbadoes*, subscribed by *Josiah Cole*, a chief Quaker and one of their reputed infallible inspired Ministers. This Copy was taken out of the Quakers registry, and afterward compared with the original.

**D**EAR *George Fox*, who art the Father of many Nations, whose life hath reached thorow us thy children even to the Isles afar off, to the begetting of many again unto a lively hope; for which generations to come shall call thee blessed, whose being and habitation is in the power of the highest, in which thou rules and governs in righteousness; and thy Kingdom is establisbed in peace, and the increase thereof is without end.

## C H A P. XXI.

**I**N this Chapter he pretends to oppose my Charge of their denial of the Resurrection of the dead, and their not professing any reward in the world to come. For the proof of the first, I gave not only many evidences that carried in them a strong presumption, but also its confession in so many words. Mr Pen's reply to which I need not consider, he himself acknowledging the truth of my Charge, by no less than undertaking a defence of that horrid principle, which if the Apostle said right makes the whole business of religion a vain and delusive thing.

§ 2. Take his own words p. 201. *Either the Resurrection of the body must be without the matter or it must not; if it must then it is not that same numerical body, and so their proper and strict taking of the word Resurrection they must let go.* Although this allows my Charge true and so enough to its' vindication, yet I shall answer P's. Arguments against the Resurrection; wherein he opposes philosophical conclusions (according to his ignorance therein) against the express doctrine of the Scriptures.

The latter part of his dilemma is the horn with which he pushes at the Resurrection, *If it must not be without that same gross matter it dyed with, then I affirm it cannot be incorruptible, because it will carry with it that which will render it corruptible ad infinitum.*

§ 3. The body must necessarily be the same matter is allowed, but he calls it in his assumption of the second part of his dilemma the same gross matter which makes his argument naught and fallacious in the form



form of it. But to let that pass, it may be and shall be the same matter and numerical, though not of the same grosseness : and shall have the same substance and essential forme, though not the same accidents.

To talk that it cannot be incorruptible because beyond the nature of matter in it self, is to talk like an Atheist ; making nature to be God, and not acknowledging the God of nature : who if he be omnipotent ( which he is or he is not God ) *he is able* ( as the Apostle speaks ) *to subdue all things to himself.* With which words he answers all cavils from impossibility in nature.

§ 4. He proceeds farther in this vain reasoning and wicked too p. 200. *I say we cannot see how that which is of the dust should be eternal, whilst that from whence it came is by nature but temporal, and that which is yet most of all irreconcilable with Scripture and right reason is, that the loss and change of nature from corruptible to incorruptible natural to Spiritual, should not make it another body.* That it is according to Scripture I have given large proof in my book, to no one of which he replies ; as also how unreasonable it is to call that a Resurrection, which is not of the same numerical body. But from what hath been said, Pen hath now put it out of all doubt, that they deny the Resurrection of the body, in a proper sense.

Concerning a reward in the world to come, which I affirm they did not profess ; he opposes rather, because he would not be thought to subscribe to me, than that he believes not what I said to be true.

He tells me p. 203. *None ever read so. He quotes no such thing. Nay he says, he has searcht but to no purpose.* My charge was not that they deny a reward in another world, but that they profess no such thing. If they had said they deny it in so many words, it had been a proof beyond my charge : but being silent to it, hath a null consequence, that *is* none of their belief.

§. 5. To

¶ 5. To my conclusion from their express principles viz. 'If they deny the body ever to live again after turned to dust, and the Soul to have any being distinct from God, there remains no subject of such reward except God himself.

The defence he makes is, first, that my argument is *obviously weak*. Secondly they *have ever held an eternal state of recompence*. My passage of Penington he corrupted and to that of his own he misapplies my consequence concealing the words on which it is grounded. Supplying his defect in argument and truth with the terms of malice, ignorance, a very lie, an infamous slander, great lie, revenge and such like.

¶ 6. But to fasten the nail irremovably. Whereas I said in the conclusion of the Chapter; 'Let them profess that they believe a happiness, to be enjoyed by men and women after their bodies be rotted to dust, distinct from the being of God, or that which they had not a thousand years before they were born *i. e.* to be in God (from whom as of his being, they say the Soul came) and it will be news to me, and all that are acquainted with them. In the mean time I have given you reason enough to conclude they believe no future blessedness or misery in another world. This I proposed for the evading all their delusive terms, and that I might draw out of them an acknowledgment of the genuine truth if they had any such in the treasury of their divinity: but as I charged P. before, so I do now again (and with him all the thorow Quakers) that his silence to this matter concludes them guilty of not owning a future reward in another world, or a life to come.

He tells me p. 204. that after my example he shall resolve the Question. See how good he is at Aping my logic.

If Quakerism (so called) be not another dispensation  
than

than that of Christ preached and settled by the Apostles, if it deny not the Scripture, if it deny not all nor any of the ordinances of the Gospel, &c. And so he goes on cleverly with his negatives to prove Quakerism Christianity by the same good logick I will prove Geometry logick, or Philosophy to be Christianity. If Geometry, &c. Deny none of these things Geometry, Logick, or Philosophy is Christianity, but neither of these deny, &c. therefore either of them are Christianity. Yea if we will pass to the concrete you may prove a horse or a goose a Christian by the same argument, for they deny none of these things. Thus he is as good as his word p. 206. where he excuses himself of having little learning (at least) to bestow on me. An excellent finishing of an ill task, by as sorry an undertaker as we use to call a dunce. I had sometime thought him not so much an ignoramus as somewhat else, but all things considered he may be emblazon'd both proper, *par te par pale*.

Thus I have honestly and clearly vindicated every Charge in that part of my book which intends the proof of Quakerism to be no Christianity, and proved that not one of them is abortive or barren of what they pretended to go big and travel withal.

---

CHAP. XXII.

**I**N his answer to the third part of my book; he saith nothing to the Chapter of the characters of Apostolical persons and inspirations wherein (it consisting of 24 pages) I agitated at large those points to the overthrow of their pretended Apostolical ministry, & inspirations of the same kind with theirs, common to all believers; on which Quakerism is founded.

In

§ 2. In My key, of 250 Particulars he excepts against ten; five of which he further explains, the other five he opposes.

¶ 3. The first of these is in p. 247. *The will of the flesh*, all that is Chosen by man, though he be there to disposed by the will of God revealed in the Scripture. This he calls *false and an abominable and notorious untruth*, I have proved at large their calling all things of a religious nature by that name, which are not by immediate inspiration: although the Scriptures have precepts and examples commanding and prescribing them.

¶ 4. The second is p. 249. *Christ the offering*. The light within. He calls this no Quakers expression. That it is a Quakers expression, take this proof. *We believe that Christ in us doth offer up himself a living sacrifice to God for us* Smith. Cat. p. 64. He might therefore have spared to Charge me with not only *mistake* but also *malice*.

¶ 5. The third *men-pleasers*. Sense. They who comply with men though in things not only lawful but also to edification. This he calls *an arrant lye* but the ground is provided he means by lawful and to edification *what we do*, I am not so silly to put such bonds on the truth.

¶ 6. *Traditions of men*. The Scripture or written word p. 250. To this he adds *but to say, they are the traditions of men, in the sense Christ reprov'd the Pharisaical religion, God forbid: I had rather my tongue were cut out of my head. O base man! to abuse an innocent people thus grossly.* I have already proved the phrase, to be the Quakers viz. *Smiths and Naylors*. The sense I gave was not a word more than *The Scripture or written word*. Which is their sense. The man was in travel to abuse me, therefore forges all these words

words he adds, and Charges them as mine to give his rage vent.

The sense I gave for theirs of the word *Babylon* is no other than *Smith, Naylor, Fox, Penington*, do express, but he jumbles four quotations together, which confusion renders him uncapable of an answer.

§ 7. *The veil is over them p. 251.* Their sense I give of this he presents the greater halfe of ( which explains the other ) by an, &c. To blind the reader, and make the Quakers believe I deserve the imputations of *Malice*, and *wicked man*; which it seems he is resolved before hand to bestow on me.

He that reads this Vindication will meet with divers passages to countenance this sense, *your carnal Christ while you are looking at a redeemer afar off, &c.*

§ 8. In his reply to my examen he is wonderful keen, and in such a fever of fury that his reason and memory (at best) fail him exceedingly, and ever and anon he talks idly. Take a short specimen. After all his civil language and meek expressions hitherto in his book, he saith *p. 206, I desire to manifest more temper, truth, and civility, than to recompence him with that ill bred language it hath pleased him to give me*; yet he so far forgets again as that within little more than the two pages next following, he adds no less than *all his discourse of Christianity interlined with so much babling, prattle, and base abuse, whether this be most a lye or an abuse? noise and base reviling. Rabble of reflection. Mountebank preists. A Quack. P. 228.* He acknowledges he Charges his adverlarie *H. H.* with *an arrant lye*, and within a few lines tells me *they did not accost them with false prophets, lyars*, terms so frequent with him, that it appears he knows not what he writes himself. I could if it were worth the while fill my pages with a rehearsal of as ugly as ill applied language: but I am not so much concerned.

The course of this management of this reply is so unfaithful, and he so blinded with passion that the first words he transcribes as mine are neither words nor sense to be found in that page, nor yet in the whole book. He bids me go wrestle in *Moor-fields*, play foot ball matches, any thing his rage suggests.

I shall therefore desire the Reader, that will think it fit to judge of my Examen, to read it with his reply; wherein he need not depend upon anothers and a parties credit: In the mean time I have learned

*Dum furor in cursu est, currenti cede furori.*

¶ 9. There is a Gentleman Mr. T. F. against whom Mr. Pen hath such a spleen, that to my great wonder I find him almost in all his writings ( I have read ) attempting his disgrace: who never wrote against him nor any other as I can hear of, and if my information fail me not, P. hath been engaged by him to another kind of deportment.

Yet I find in Mr. Pen such implacableness toward that person, that he proposes a way of revenge that I never knew man in his wits do in print with his name subscribed, viz. *Some think it a shame, that so ill a tongue should go unrebuk'd of those whose principles and interest give them the liberty of doing it in a way ( that if they know the man ) might be more effectual than all the moderation and reason that can easily be shewn to him, p. 220.* A strange way that must be beside such reason, which must needs be unjust, and beyond such moderation too, which must be excessive violence. But the highest of all the mischief is in those words, *if they know the man*: wherein there is an abyts of bad sense, it being only needful for them to know him to fit them for the feat. I profess

for

for my part I know not what to make of many of his expressions, but that he would have the world rid some way or other of many that offend him; yet all I could ever find this Person charged with by P. was some hard names by him in private converse with P. given to George Fox, of all which (except two which are not so easily construed) to use Pen's words of his own bad language, it may be said, 'tis all true, all his due.

¶ 10. To conclude, I shall desire Mr. Pen (if he dare come to that test) to appoint some of his friends (that can but read english) to give me a meeting, and I do promise to make it appear to them, that he hath in abundance of places egregiously played the forger, foisting into my sentences words of his own to serve his design: yea, and framing whole sentences and calling them mine which were never in my Book nor the sense of them, which is such a cheat, that all who understand controversie will judge him worthy to be made a Proverb of, and when they intend to express an impudent forger, to say no more, but *W. Pen.*

¶ 11. It will somewhat better become him to write in rhithim and pretend to Poetry (which may suit his fictitious and furious fancy, and also his flashy wit) than to abuse controversial Divinity with such a leprosie: so may he come off with two words, viz. *Poeta licentia*, and be excused into the bargain his defect of reason, which is so necessary a vertue and property in Quakerism, that to prevent our expectation of reason from the Quakers, and save us the labour of applying that carnal thing to the tryal and search of their principles, A great Poet of their own hath these words, worthy to begin all Mr. Pns books on that Subject, as it ends this of mine *And they that would be satisfied concerning us any way, they must find us and know us in the principle of life where we are, and not*

in

*in their own reason where we are not, for it is not possible to find a man, where he is not, or to know him 'till he be found and be held in the place where he moveth, and so let none REASON about us, for there they can never know us, nor come unto us, &c. Smith Catech. p. 94.*

## FINIS:

## ERRATA.

Reader, I desire thee to correct by this Errata some escapes in the book. Some others there are not so material, except in the first sheet which is so much wronged, and mispointed, that I had some thoughts of printing it over again.

**P**AGE 1. line ult. read *my*. p. 2. l. 15. r. *within themselves should* be so amply. l. 16. *irruption*. p. 4. l. 2. *therefore &c.* p. 24. l. 2. *the Papists*. p. 28. l. 14. *in P's*. p. 32. l. 18. *valid*. p. 41. l. 24. *W. S.* p. 44. l. 10. *dele hanging*. p. 46. l. 18. *dele whereas*. p. 59. l. 3. r. *yea if what P. saith be true*. p. 60. l. 15. *affect*.



